

WEDWELL

**A Personal Narrative
of a U. S. Forest Service Landscape Architect
in the 1958-86 Period**

Wayne Dahl Iverson
November 1993

From Gary Drogan 10/93

FOREWORD.

The following narrative covers some of my work as a U. S. Forest Service landscape architect from 1958-1986 and is necessarily based upon my own views of what, how, and why things happened along the way. It may appear that I gave myself too much credit for some things that others felt they originated or were equally involved with. That is probably true. I learned a lot from those I worked with and never backed away from collecting and combining ideas. Eclecticism seemed to be an acceptable avenue. In some places there may seem to be an unnecessary degree of technical detail. That may be true but it seemed important to leave some of those technical tracks. I am sure I left out many names and events that should have been included. Likewise, I included some negative information and feelings about some individuals which may or may not be prudent of me, or deserved of them. But, such things were included after considered judgment. If I felt strong enough about such incidents, I included them as I saw them. And lastly, I'd really like to know about and correct inaccurate information.

Wayne D. Iverson. November, 1993.

I. Breaking into the Forest Service.

In early 1957 while working in the National Park Service's Western Office of Design & Construction Master Planning Branch in San Francisco I came across an advertisement in the ASLA newsletter for two landscape architect positions in the U. S. Forest Service's Northern Region in Missoula, Montana. The Park Service job was interesting, but I was spending day in and day out over a drafting board without a chance to get out in the parks. It was frustrating to attempt to develop master plans for areas I had never seen. When I accepted the job I had decided to temporarily put up with living in a large city in order to gain some excellent experience, but my heart lay in the wide open spaces of parks and forests. Opportunities in the NPS for being assigned to a park rather than a Design & Construction Office or a Regional Office were almost negligible for a young landscape architect.

After filling out a Civil Service Commission Form 57, I applied for the job thinking I had a good chance at it. After all, when I applied to the National Park Service a year earlier while winding up my Master's degree, I had gotten offers of jobs in the Regional Office in Richmond, Virginia, on the Natchez Trace Parkway in Tupelo, Mississippi, and the Western Office of Design & Construction in San Francisco. Landscape architects were in short supply in those days. In addition to the National Park Service job offers, I had received offers from the Corps of Engineers' Omaha, Nebraska office; Mahoning County Planning Department in Ohio; a large private office in the northwest suburbs of Chicago, and the State Parks Department of Wisconsin. With a military service preference, a Master's degree, and nearly a year's experience with the National Park Service in master planning, I felt confident that an agency such as the Forest Service would snap me up.

Several weeks later I received a letter indicating from the Forest Service indicating that their funding had been cut short and they would not fill the position. Years later I learned that Joe Gutkowski had been hired as a landscape architect by the Northern Region at the time. He was working temporarily as a smoke jumper for the Forest Service prior to his appointment as landscape architect. Joe spent some time in the Regional Office but most of the rest of his career in Bozeman, Montana as forest landscape architect on the Gallatin National Forest.

I had not heard of the Forest Service's Operation Outdoors Program in 1957 but by early 1958 it was initiated and being publicized. Another advertisement for a landscape architect appeared in the ASLA newsletter. This time for a position in Upper Darby, Pennsylvania with the Northeast Region. I applied in early April for a job with the Forest Service—no specific location limitation. They filled the Philadelphia job with Bob McHaffey and forwarded my application on to the Milwaukee office which forwarded it on to the San Francisco office of the Forest Service. From there I received an invitation for an interview with Regional Landscape Architect R. D'Arcy Bonnet.

Upon seeing Bonnet, I immediately changed my opinion of the Forest Service. First, I had not expected that that office would yet have any landscape architects employed. Further, I thought that if they did the individual would be poorly trained and just as scraggly looking as the old forests. R. D'Arcy Bonnet was then 51 years old—and therefore met part of my expectations. However, he was an immaculately dressed gentleman, bald with white fringes and bright, twinkling eyes, and a hawk nose. He had been in that job since 1939. Further, he had a Master's degree in Landscape Architecture from Harvard—the highest possible credentials in those days. Bonnet was as impressive as the top landscape architect and Chief of the National Park Service's Western Office

of Design & Construction, Sanford "Red" Hill. So much for my preconceived ideas about the Forest Service!

Bonnet noted that I was young and appeared healthy and able to get around in the woods, and had the necessary education. He then looked over some of the master plans I had prepared in the National Park Service. These were of little interest to him—possibly because of the traditional rivalry between the National Park Service and the U. S. Forest Service. All that I had taken with me to show other than the master plans was my thesis—A Master and Developmental Plan for Cox Hollow State Park. He glanced through it and then said, "That's it! That is exactly what I had hoped to see—that's the kind of planning we want to do." He assured me that there would be a position for me very shortly. The 1970 Winter Olympics were scheduled for Squaw Valley in Tahoe National Forest and he said I should plan to become the landscape architect for that forest with headquarters in Nevada, City, California as they needed help in preparing for the Olympics.

Meanwhile Barbara and I were married in Berkeley on May 17, 1956 and honeymooned in northern California and southern Oregon. The wide open spaces of the national forests were appealing to both of us. On the way back to the Bay Area we stopped by what we expected would be our new home, Nevada City. We drove by the Forest Supervisor's Office and looked forward to the change in scenery. Barbara had lived in the Sierra Nevadas at Portola for a time and had a feel for small mountain communities.

But there was a change of plans for me by the Forest Service. They had decided to assign me to the Inyo National Forest on the other side of the Sierra Nevada. It was a disappointment as I really wanted to work in a real forest, not in a desert! We decided to give it a try and later get transferred to a forest with trees. I had begun in August 1957 as a GS-7 in the National Park Service at \$4525 per year and was now to receive \$6285 per year as a GS-9 and get an opportunity to get out of the office frequently.

I informed my National Park Service boss, Paul Thomas. He was not pleased with my decision to leave and asked if I really understood what a drop in the level of professional landscape architecture I was about to embark upon. Others in the Park Service cautioned me that it was not a wise move—the National Park Service was the leader in the field. Instead of being a part of the leading edge of the profession, I would disappear into the backwaters. Yet, being on my own and spending much time on the land rather than cooped up in a huge design office in the middle of San Francisco was more important to me. Besides, it appeared that the vast open spaces of the National Forests was just beginning to open up for major recreation development. A professor of wildlife ecology at the University of Wisconsin had made such a prediction as part of his last lecture to us a couple of years earlier and it had stuck with me as the most important thing he had to say all semester.

II. In Bishop, California as Forest Landscape Architect.

The last weekend in June 1958 we left San Francisco pulling a 4' x 8' U-Haul trailer behind our 1953 Plymouth sedan. All of our belongings fit easily into it with room to spare. We looked across the sagebrush desert as we dropped down from the Sierra range. We reaffirmed our resolve to plan for an eventual transfer on to a national forest with trees. After locating a motel, we inquired about rentals. By chance, the motel owner's mother had a couple of converted garage apartments out in back and one was vacant. We knew the rental market was tight in Bishop so we quickly accepted the opportunity—at \$75 per month for a nice modern one bedroom apartment of about 600 square feet.

On Monday, June 30th I reported for work. The receptionist took me in to see Forest Supervisor Joe Radel and I was relieved that he appeared to be a caring land steward type of forester rather than a rough-talking lumberman. Radel's facial characteristics reminded me of a cross between Alec Guinness and Jim Backus. Upon learning that Barbara had been working as a secretary in University of California President Sproul's office, he suggested that she could also be employed in the office. However, Barbara had been looking forward to time free of an office environment. Supervisor Radel invited me to accompany him for a couple of days in the field to give me an overview of the forest while he carried on some necessary business with the district rangers. I felt that I was a welcome addition to the forest staff. It was a surprise to me upon getting a copy of my job description that I was also assigned 25% of my time to the Stanislaus National Forest on the west slope of the Sierra Nevada. That was not in the bargain, but that forest did have heavy tree cover.

My immediate supervisor, Lloyd Hayes, was just in the process of moving into the Supervisor's Office from his position as District Ranger on the Mono Lake District on the north end of the forest. He had done some campground construction work and was interested in the recreation field so he got the job. His new staff position included recreation, lands, fire, and timber management.

The Inyo National Forest was undergoing some major increases in personnel at the time. Only a year or so previously they had gotten their first graduate engineer as forest engineer, Vic De Kalb. At the same time as I reported for duty, an assistant engineer, Burt Wieck had been hired. Burt had worked previously as a technician for the Minnesota Highway Department. Phil Winkel had just reported for duty as range conservationist, coming from a similar position in Tuba City, Arizona with the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

The Supervisor's Office management team consisted of Forest Supervisor Radel, Administrative Officer Gordon Clark, Lloyd Hayes, Del Faussett (Range and Wildlife Staff Officer), and Forest Engineer Vic DeKalb. There were at the time four clerks working under Clark. Thus the total office force consisted of 12 people—an increase from 8 a month earlier! There was also a crew under the Forest Engineer's supervision— Construction and Maintenance Foreman Henry Thorne, radio technician Walt Smith, warehouseman/sign maker Cliff Crawford, and trail crew foreman Lawrence Cline who were stationed out at the Forest Compound out on North Main Street.

Two of Joe Radel's major concerns were about the criticism he was getting over the new timber access road into the Deadman area and how to develop and protect the recently discovered "oldest living things on earth"—the Bristlecone Pine Botanic Area had been established on the crest of the White Mountains east of town. In addition, Inyo National Forest was beginning to get construction funding for campgrounds and picnic areas and there was need for my assistance to the engineering

people on staking and inspections. I asked about their master plan—certainly they had a master plan to determine what would be developed where and when. No, there was no master plan and it probably wasn't necessary in their viewpoint. Such fancy planning may have been appropriate for the National Park Service, but the Forest Service just took the bull by the horns and built what was needed.

I was shown my desk in the room adjacent to Forest Supervisor Radel. The room was about 10 feet by 10 feet and shared with my supervisor. Our desks butted against one another and we both had just enough room to slide our chairs back a foot or so to get in and out of the desks. There was no drafting table for me—a bit shocking for a young landscape architect—and moreover there was no room for one if it was to be purchased. Likewise, there was no drafting machine, T-square, triangles or other drafting tools. I was provided with a small and shaky, ancient plane table for field survey work. There was no alidade—not even the old iron type with a peephole and coarse cross-hairs! A large old nickel-plated brass compass, about 5 inches square, with a vertical crosshair was the tool to determine magnetic north on the survey maps. The tool provided for measuring distances was a 66 foot steel tape—referred to as a chain tape since a “chain” is 1/330th of a mile—a ten acre parcel of land is ten chains square. Thus, my tools set me up quite well for land surveying at 1880 standards, but was not quite up to the needs for detailed recreation site surveys in the late 1950s.

I brought in my own T-square, triangles and drafting set. After a couple of weeks Lloyd Hayes had sufficient faith in my staying on to give me the GSA catalog and permitted me to order about \$100 in supplies. The solution for the limited space was a small portable drafting table that would set up on the top of my desk when in use and could be stacked against the wall at other times. D'Arcy Bonnet promised the forest that he would send a telescopic alidade and new plane table in a few weeks.

Meanwhile, I used the ancient plane table for some survey work. However, it was seldom possible to get the help of a rodman. Thus, I would set up the plane table, pound a wood stake in the ground under it, take a reading on magnetic north, stick a pin in the station point above the stake, pivot my triangular scale around the pin and sight on it to a tree or other object to be surveyed, and draw a light line on the plane table paper along the edge of the triangular scale. Then I would “throw” the tape to unwind it—steel tape winding and “throwing” was an art to be learned. If not wound correctly in a correctly twisted figure 8, it could not be made into a small circular loop about 12-15 inches in diameter. It could easily become a tangled mess and be kinked and broken. After “throwing” the steel tape to unleash it to a figure 8, it was carefully unwound. With the aid of a large spike to pin one end, it was then possible to measure the distance to the object being surveyed and scale and mark it on the plane table map paper—not the most efficient system.

We had a small fleet of vehicles at the warehouse area for transportation out to the field. Several of them were Navy surplus pick-ups from the Hawthorne, Nevada Naval Ammunition Depot. My shared (with Lloyd Hayes) vehicle was one of these old gray trucks.

During the “get-acquainted” trip with Joe Radel, it became obvious to me that there were some trepidations on the part of the District Rangers and their staffs that the Supervisor's Office was growing too fast and hiring specialists of questionable need. There also was concern that Forest Supervisor Radel saw fit to personally show me around the forest—it seemed to indicate over-emphasis on the landscape architect position on the forest. There was apparent fear that some of their duties would be taken over by the central office.

To many, the hiring of a landscape architect was going a bit too far. Veteran District Ranger Barney Sweatt at Mammoth Lakes District had done considerable campground planning on his district and seemed to enjoy that phase of his job. Now I would take over that work throughout the forest. The general feeling of the rangers was that the Regional Office forced the position on the forest and that Forest Supervisor Joe Radel did not stand his ground. They felt that the only salvation was that the landscape architect position would probably be terminated in a year or two when the individual completed all the campground and picnic ground plans for the Operation Outdoors program.

Many of them did not know that Inyo National Forest had previously employed a landscape architect in 1948-51. Charlie Peyrone had first worked on the Sequoia National Forest during the Civilian Conservation Corps days and the war years and came to the Inyo with the Post-WWII effort to rehabilitate the recreation facilities. When funding for his position ran out he was appointed District Ranger for the Big Pine Unit as he apparently was too valued to lose from the agency. However, he left in 1951 or early 1952 to accept a position with Santa Clara Parks Department.

My previous work with the National Park Service was another hindrance to being fully accepted. The Park Service and Forest Service had always been squabbling over public recreation land management. Part of Inyo National Forest in the Red's Meadow area had once been included in a National Park Service expansion plan for Yosemite National Park. When in that area during the "get acquainted" trip, Assistant Ranger Bill Murphy learned of my NPS background and halfway jokingly suggested that I might be a NPS mole working on renewing such expansion plans. There was still a deep-rooted distrust of the National Park Service.

Mammoth Mountain Inn, a major new Forest special use across from the rapidly developing Mammoth Mountain Ski Area, was under construction at the time. D'Arcy Bonnet came over to look over the situation and an on-the-spot decision to build a large employee dormitory behind the Inn was made. The Inn design was quite nice, but I was taken back at the lack of total site planning on this massive project. Parking had not really been addressed in the planning. An area in front was supposedly to take care of the needs, but what happened in a snowstorm? Although covered parking was considered too expensive at the time, it ultimately had to be provided.

I was informed that the forest had ordered low level aerial photography of the major recreation complexes. This was great news as it would make the study of potential sites easier. I was delegated to fly as an observer in the Regional Office' plane and direct the photography. Being new to the forest, I had no idea of where many recreation complexes were located. Despite the wish to have the opportunity to get a good overview of the forest, I had to beg off and request Range & Wildlife Staff Officer Del Faussett to guide the pilot and photographer. He had been on the forest about two decades and was intimately familiar with it from either ground or aerial views. I had not been around long enough to differentiate one canyon from another from the air. Thus I felt I had possibly fallen short of my performance needs within the first two weeks on the job.

It was obvious to me that I had to prove my worth to the ranger staffs and that it might not be easy. Having to handle two separate national forests somewhat complicated things, but also was helpful in some ways. Ranger Dick Wilson tested me out by taking me up to the Bristlecone Pine Botanic Area to survey and plan a campground at Pine Alpha Grove. Rather than returning home at night he decided we should take sleeping bags and groceries and sleep in the back of his pick-up truck. It

may have been a matter of saving on gas---we traveled on our own time in those days---but I suspect he wanted to see if the city-slicker landscape architect could handle such working conditions. He did not know that I was originally a small town boy who loved to hike, hunt, trap, fish and camp out. Dick served as my chainman and we got to know and respect each other.

He had definite ideas of how he wanted the site designed. I managed to convince him not to permit camping in that tiny sensitive site but to develop a picnic ground with an interpretive kiosk set in a native flagstone area---and to place the administrator's trailer and facilities back around the hill in an adjacent cove out of sight of the public. This might not have been possible if we hadn't camped out and had time to discuss such philosophies in depth. Dick was a very sensitive ranger who nevertheless loved to be viewed as the tough "dirt forester". Being well over 6 feet tall and weighing about 250 pounds, it was easy for him to play that role. He was an accomplished photographer with a keen sense of curiosity, love for philosophic discussions and exploration of new ideas.

Another early assignment high on Radel's priority list was a site plan for Minaret Vista, a spectacular viewpoint on the crest of the Sierra Nevadas between the developing Mammoth Mountain Ski Area on the east slope and Reds Meadow Recreation Area and Devil's Postpile National Monument on the west slope. Assistant District Ranger Bill Murphy of Mammoth Lakes District also was anxious to improve this site as well. It was undeveloped except for a rough dirt road littered with protruding rocks and a fixed mounted pipe "telescope" that was aimed at the Minarets rock spires on the border of Yosemite National Park across the valley. I designed a semi-circular rock masonry parapet wall set on top of the highest knob of rock. In the central section of the top of the wall was to be a heavy metal cutout of the silhouette of the Minarets and the other skyline mountain peaks. And, at each end were to be pipe "telescopes" that could be turned and raised or lowered to point out specific features which were identified by a pointer at the base. The site was to have a circular parking area/turnaround tucked in the low spot on the ridge and a few picnic tables on the east slope with views across to Glass Mountain and the White Mountain range. Admittedly, it was a more highly developed proposal than the district had envisioned and the large rock parapet wall and flagstone pavement would require considerable labor.

However, Bill Murphy and his District fire crew which doubled as a recreation construction and maintenance crew became enthusiastic about it and quickly began work on the project. They improvised on the "telescope", using old auto-U-joints to allow for raising and lowering the tube, and the tips of old files for the pointers. It turned out quite well for the time and money available, and seemed to help justify the presence of a landscape architect on the forest.

Bill and wife and their nine or ten children from age one to about twelve had a Forest Service home next to the Ranger Station. They were very likable but had difficulty keeping the place looking as neat as the Forest Service expected. With that many children and the long hours put in by Bill, it was understandable. He sometimes let his frustrations with all his job and family obligations fall on forest visitors. After spending several after-duty hours helping to haul out a battered, dead body of a forest recreationist who fell from Crystal Crag, he was accosted by a camper who demanded to know why Bill was not planting more trout in the creek. The camper was unable to catch any trout so someone else must be to blame. "After all I pay your salary", the camper exclaimed. Bill had had it! He was exhausted and needed to get home to the family. He took a penny out of his pocket and handed it to the camper saying, "Here, dammit, take your money back!" That was not the type of public relations Forest Supervisor Joe Radel was after, but it seemed appropriate at the time to Bill.

Forest Supervisor Joe Radel was sensitive to the public, and he was then being criticized by the Sierra Club for the ugliness of the Deadman road. They had previously battled against the opening of that area to timber harvesting. He assigned me the task of "prettying it up" somehow. Knowing the problem, I worried more than necessary over it. I really was not prepared at that time in my short career to quickly develop measures to mitigate the damage and don't think I lived up to his expectations on that project or gave it as much time as needed to really deal with the problem. The road had been mistakenly built straight across an open flat for a couple of miles causing it to visually split a splendid and previously unified mountain scene. The ditching on either side further emphasized the visual scarring. Small root wads and construction debris along the edge of the graded area added more visual impact. It was not then practical to obliterate the new road and move it to a curving alignment along and into the edge of the timber, so all I could do is suggest that the ditches and berms be regraded or raked to blend better and that the root wads be hauled away and buried. Here I felt that I had failed. It bothered me enough that I felt ill about it and took off a day of sick leave—wondering if I was really up to the job. Sometimes it would surely be nice to work under an experienced landscape architect and forgo the luxury of being on your own.

Other than the Deadman timber/recreation access road, there was no effort to get landscape architects involved with timber harvesting. And, I was not ready to stick my nose in their activities farther than occasionally complaining about the visual impacts of a skid trail on a hillside near the highway or of temporary brush piles in that travel corridor. The Inyo was cutting only about 5-10 million board feet of Jeffrey pine a year at the time using selection harvest, and almost all of the slash was being chipped on site. The visual impacts of timber harvest were not great and I was not well enough versed in that aspect of forest management to question it.

It was a sink or swim situation for newly hired landscape architects. I could write notes to D'Arcy Bonnet for advice but at that time making a long distance call to San Francisco was reserved for only very critical situations. We were over 400 miles apart. There was no one else to look to for technical guidance—not another landscape architect of any type within 200 miles. No one on the forest had much of any idea of what a landscape architect could or should do. How to supervise one of these characters was a mystery—the immediate supervisors of landscape architects just hoped to Hell that they didn't stray too far from traditional Forest Service working characteristics or do something bizarre that would embarrass the supervisor or get them in trouble. It made them nervous. Yet, it seemed clear that my supervisor, the district rangers, and Forest Supervisor Radel all were inwardly pleased to be able to tell the permittees or the public, "I'll have my landscape architect take a look at it", or "We'll have our landscape architect draw up something on it."

I was quite appalled by the campground site plans on file at the forest. Although it might have been expected for the 1930s, the plans at a scale of 100 feet equaling an inch prepared in the 1956-58 period by Jim Sears seemed to be inappropriate. This was especially true when the construction was being contracted. The roads were drawn freehand and the plan was planimetric—no contours. The toilets were indicated in diagrammatic elevational views rather than specifically located plan views—so were the camp units, water hydrants, etc.

The one good thing I noted is that these plans often boldly moved camping well back from the worn down creek and lakefronts. This was undoubtedly necessary in order to gain D'Arcy Bonnet's approval. I became a stubborn advocate of that same philosophy as it seemed essential to leave the waterfronts open to everyone to use, and not to allow them to be beaten into a barren pulp. The old-time campers screamed bloody murder when they were forced back away from the

water's edge after campground rehabilitation—but it seemed that it had to be done and that they were just born too late to continue such luxuries as squatting right at the water's edge and blocking public creekside access.

Forest Engineer DeKalb was doing his best to interpret the site plans and stake them out. He was delighted when his new assistant Burt Wieck and I worked closely together to continue that work. We had to interpret the plans as well—the location of toilets, vehicle spurs and camp units were strictly diagrammatic on the plans and we had to do considerable shifting to make reasonable staking layouts. At first there was a problem in road and spur staking since Wieck was accustomed to state highway standards. His concerns were for smooth vertical and horizontal curves—not in fitting the road and spurs lightly on the land. But he was willing to change his ways when the reasons were explained and progress was rapidly made.

Rock Creek Campground was under contract construction soon after I arrived. East and West Twin Lakes Campground roads had been built the previous year by contract and the toilet, camp unit, and barrier system was being developed by force account by the Mammoth Lakes District. Red's Meadows Campground had been partially constructed but needed a barrier system to control vehicle damage to the vegetation and soils. Convict Lake Campground was ready to be constructed. The Rock Creek and Convict Lakes site plans had been prepared by Jim Sears of the Regional Office and District Ranger Barney Sweatt had planned the Twin Lakes and Red's Meadows Campgrounds.

In between projects I attempted to develop a master-planning system for recreation development on the forest. It drew no interest from Lloyd Hayes. The agency was not yet ready for such planning sophistication—there was real work to be done to take care of the overwhelming public use taking place. It was kind of a "We don't have time to plan—we're trying to get out of the mess we're already in" reaction. It was possible to develop small scale (1" = 500-600') existing condition plans of entire canyons from the new aerial photos. Despite lack of support, I began to do so and developed a couple of "master plans" for development of some of the canyon recreation complexes such as Big Pine Creek.

I was assigned a crash project of planning an access road and parking area for June Lake Beach. Two road-accessible lakes on the forest had no visible drainages to other nearby chains or clusters of lakes. Swimming was prohibited in all other waters that drained into the City of Los Angeles Department of Power & Water Owens Valley system that included most of the forest. June Lake was one of the two lakes where swimming was permissible. Lloyd Hayes convinced Mono County to build a road and parking area and now they were ready to go at it with their bulldozers and graders. A plan was needed if he was to keep out of trouble with the Regional Office. However, Lloyd had little use for engineers so purposely neglected to tell the forest engineer. Naively, I rushed out and did a quick and dirty survey and flagged and lath-staked the access road centerline and the outside clearing edges of a couple of parking areas on the two sections of beach separated by a low rocky ridge. The road was being built as the plan was being drafted! It was immediately approved and sent into the Regional Office for approval by D'Arcy Bonnet and Assistant Regional Forester for Recreation and Lands Millard Barnum. But, by the time they got it, the County had completed the job. Luckily, it was approved a few weeks later and Bonnet was not aware that it had been completed before he saw the plans.

Problems of overuse and soil erosion were occurring at the other lake without an outlet, Horseshoe Lake. The lake was at about 9000 feet in elevation so the water was bone-chilling, but was used

heavily—especially the broad beaches of light colored pumice. I was asked to prepare a site plan to accommodate a few group camps, a picnic area and parking for the beach. At the time it had a couple of old pit privies and a spider web of a road system in light pumice soils through the lodgepole, western larch and white-barked pine trees. As usual, it was not possible to get any surveying help so I had another one man survey party. I managed to do another plane table survey without benefit of an alidade. It was a large enough site to require a dozen or more plane table set-ups. Luckily the triangular chain of traverses each closed with 3-4 feet.

That summer Joe Radel received a polished cross-section of an ancient piece of White Mountain bristlecone pine from Dendrochronologist Dr. Ferguson of the University of Arizona Tree Ring Laboratory to be used for public display. Since landscape architects were then expected to handle anything artistic including the calligraphy on awards and design of office Christmas cards, he asked me to design a small showcase for it along with interpretation of the slab of wood. The aging warehouseman/carpenter/sign-maker Cliff Crawford would build the case. The 1000 year rings had been indicated on the cross-section so I interpreted it with colored yarn, pins and labels pointing out such dates as 1776, 1492, 1066, and the birth of Christ. I also added the birth of Mohammed as it neatly filled in a spot between 1 A. D. and 1066 and seemed to me to be appropriately less sectarian for a federal agency display—even though I was well aware that Joe and Mary Radel were strong Christians and he sometimes filled in for their minister at church services. When Joe saw this he grimaced and gasped and asked why in the world I had shown such an obscure fact—was I by chance of the Muslim faith? My explanation satisfied him and he agreed it was okay to leave it on. This illustrates his open-mindedness that helped create a good working environment on the forest.

Ranger Wilson further tested me by working with me a bit later on the plane table survey of Glacier Lodge Campground in Big Pine Canyon. Again he served as rodman, but by this time I had received the new telescopic alidade, plane table and leveling rod. I had spent much of the previous weekend boning up on the operation of the new survey equipment and even gone to the point of taking Barbara out in the desert east of town to test it out. I had surveyed with a Dumpy Level and transit in college, but never with a plane table. Yet I was convinced that it would be the most appropriate surveying tool for our type of work. Dick and I patiently worked out how to operate the plane table survey system in actual practice, discussed recreation planning philosophy, and developed more rapport. I was not yet ready to break the traditional Regional barrier with topographic mapping so it was a planimetric survey, but with considerable detail at a scale of 1 inch equals forty feet.

Late in the summer Inyo Forest engineer Vic DeKalb was transferred with promotion to a San Bernardino National Forest and Chuck Fankboner, an assistant engineer from the Sierra NF took his place. Chuck had spent much of his career as a civilian engineer with the military—most recently in Germany. My first run-in with him was over signs. Recreation site signs such as “One Way” and “Yield” were traditionally rustic wood signs—routed white letters on a dark brown stained background. Chuck picked up on new directions on road signing and insisted that we convert to the standard glaring black and white metal road signs for uniformity and safety. This seemed ridiculous to me for the interior of campgrounds and picnic grounds where the cars were traveling at about 10-15 mph. I was so incensed that I dropped a note to Joe Radel that “If the Inyo NF switched over to the large and garish metal signs, I would personally go out on weekends and shoot them full of holes”. It was not a very sensible threat to make, but Joe Radel indicated that he too agreed that rustic wood signs were appropriate in recreation sites.

I soon ran into conflicts with Fankboner on the matter of fitting campground roads and spurs to the landscape at Convict Lake campground. The design for the roadway had been elevated considerably above the ground or cut into side slopes in some parts of the campground on the approved engineering plans. It was too late to do much to change this since the contract had been let. However, I felt that it was still possible to ramp the campground spurs up or down as needed at 10% and leveled off near natural ground level at the rear for the parked vehicles. Chuck was not amenable to this so I arranged with Lloyd Hayes to have a meeting in the office to resolve the problem. We gained reluctant agreement with him to ramp the spurs to fit the land.

The Stanislaus National Forest sent several requests over to the Inyo asking when I could come over and work for them. They felt they were being short-changed. Lloyd Hayes kept putting them off saying that it was essential for me to complete survey, design and construction supervision work on the Inyo. Finally, in November he set up a four or six week detail for me on the Stanislaus.

Barbara and I packed our bags and headed over Sonora Pass before it closed. In the Supervisor's Office in Sonora I met Forest Supervisor McRorey and Recreation, Lands and Range Staff Officer Alan MacCready to get my assignments. Much of the work in the first part of the detail would be on the Pinecrest District so we settled into a tiny cabin with kitchenette a few miles west at Slide Inn near Long Barn for which we paid about \$50 per week. That was not too much out of line with the per diem rate at the time of \$7 per day. I was later to learn that Administrative Officer Gordon Clark on the Inyo considered \$7 too much for extended stays and had wanted to reduce it to \$3-4. Lloyd Hayes managed to argue him out of the per diem cut.

Alan MacCready was determined to get some campgrounds designed in the Lake Alpine area before the winter snow closed the area. He arranged to meet us in Sonora and drive to Lake Alpine. He had agreed that Barbara could come along but that we might have to stay in a cow camp and would need sleeping bags and do our own camp cooking. Alan was then about 55 and nearing retirement. He was another bright and sensitive forester, but a typical Scotsman who liked to cut corners and be very efficient in every move. He did enjoy the luxury of smoking a cigar now and then, but used a toothpick to hold the butt in order to get the last possible draw of smoke.

Mac decided that it would be best to survey the highest altitude campground first. As I recall, it was Bloomfield. Since he planned that we would survey two campgrounds the first day and another larger one the second day, there was not more than ten minutes to quickly stride through the area to get a feel for it. Then, when I had the plane table set up Mac would dart along with the stadia rod and I would plot the points on the plane table map. To save time, he took it upon himself to decide where the road centerline would be and where the camp units would be located. All I was to do was to plot the points and then draft it up later. That way there was no need to get locations of major trees or other landscape features. We did manage to cursorily survey the two campgrounds that day. I got the feeling that he expected that I'd only be in the Forest Service a year or so and he had to take advantage of the opportunity to get plans on the shelf so that they could get moving on rehabilitation and construction of campgrounds. Their difficulty in breaking me loose from the Inyo NF made it all the more urgent to prepare plans while the opportunity existed.

On the way up we had stopped at a Forest Service administrative camp just below Silvertip Campground in the Lake Alpine area and checked it out. The tent platform was there but the tent had been removed for the winter. Across the road to the south was a log cabin cow camp but it was

locked up for the winter. We could break the lock in an emergency. Now, late in the day we stopped in at Lake Alpine Lodge a few miles up the road where we found that an old couple was staying on as winter caretakers and cloud-seeders. All they would provide for us in the way of lodging were two flimsy cabins. They didn't consider it possible to let us bunk down in the lodge. However they did let fix us up some dinner in their cabin and related how they also turned on the silver iodide generators when directed to do so by the water agency. The generators were used to seed the clouds and increase the snowpack in the mountains. Barbara and I wended our way up the hill with the a flashlight to light the way. The cabin had no interior wall—the two-by-four studs were exposed. The clapboards on the outer wall did not overlap in all cases and the cold wind whistled through. Our double sleeping bag was not adequate to provide a warm restful night, but we survived.

The third campground was surveyed the next day following the same procedures. I began to have my doubts about staying on with the Forest Service if this is the way they planned and designed recreation sites. In school I had been taught to carefully study the site and immediate surroundings, analyze the data, proceed to site surveys if things appeared feasible, draft up preliminary plans in the office, check them out and modify them as necessary in the field, and then go on to the final drafting of the site plan. MacCready's method lumped this into (1) site survey and design and (2) final site plan drafting. I was expected to draft up each plan in about four hours—it was a cost-saving approach. However, I did not at all feel comfortable with the final results.

Since we planned to drive over from the Stanislaus National Forest to the Bay Area for Thanksgiving with Barbara's family in Los Altos, I decided I needed to have a talk with D'Arcy Bonnet. If he condoned such planning and design I planned to look for other work. I had not come to work for the Forest Service in order to be a surveyor/draftsman—I yearned to be involved in some detailed down-to-earth design after spending two years master planning National Park and Monuments, mostly without ever having been on the site. I found D'Arcy in the office the day after Thanksgiving and he took time out to let me spill out my concerns. He reassured me that MacCready's system was not the way he wanted it done. Rather, we should take more time and not allow the Staff Officer to dictate the design. On the average we should allow a day for the planning, survey, design and drafting of each five campground units. Thus a 25 unit campground should be completed in five working days—with an approved site plan resulting. That may seem to be whirlwind speed in today's world, but it was a reasonable time frame to me in 1958 compared to what I expected to do on the Stanislaus NF. I was greatly relieved. D'Arcy promised to call MacCready and tell him to allow me to do the job right.

During that period Bonnet had two people working under him in the Regional Office. Jim Sears was not a trained landscape architect but an engineering technician who had considerable experience in plane table surveying. Sears spent most of his time in the field covering forests which had no other recreation planning help. His drafting and design skills were quite limited. Reginald Miller was a trained landscape architect who had worked for the agency previously during the Civilian Conservation Corps days and was hired once again in late 1958. He specialized in administrative site planning—ranger stations, work centers, etc. Elsewhere in the field there was Ed Carpenter stationed on the Sierra National Forest. He had a forestry background and also was proficient at plane table surveying. He had good drafting skills but was limited in creative design skills. Ed also covered much of the Region as a recreation and campground planner in prior years. He once had been a District Ranger but apparently was not well suited for the job pressures of that position. Then there was another forester, Mel Lieurence, on the Tahoe National Forest who did some work on recreation and campground planning. Bonnet had little choice in having to utilize

Sears, Carpenter and Lieurence for such work—they were just assigned to him in 1956 when he had requested hiring a couple of landscape architects.

I learned from Bonnet that two other trained landscape architects had been hired since I was brought on board. Vic Schulman, a graduate of SUNY about ten years previous, had been hired for the Angeles National Forest and was to spend 25% of his time on the neighboring Los Padres National Forest. Vic had been teaching school in Eureka, California for a few years. Ray Collins, the first black landscape architect in the Forest Service had just been hired on the San Bernardino National Forest and he also spent 25% of his time on the Cleveland National Forest to the south. Ray was a Michigan State University graduate with a couple of years of private office experience in the St. Louis area.

The Forest Service was gearing up for Operation Outdoors. I was pleased to be on the ground floor of that expansion and happy as a clam that I was not on the Angeles, Cleveland, San Bernardino or Los Padres National Forests. The Inyo National Forest had turned out to be a scenic wonderland for me despite its lack of timber along Highway 395. It had one of the heaviest loads of recreation visitors of all the national forests in the country but Bishop was yet providing a desired small town atmosphere. The Bishop area had a population of about 7000 when considering the surrounding subdivisions under county jurisdiction. It had excellent schools and medical facilities—a fine place to start a family. Teachers and doctors who loved the outdoor life waited in line to work there.

Back on the Stanislaus National Forest, it appeared that Mac MacCready had gotten the word from D'Arcy Bonnet and the surveying and design was less hectic for the remainder of the long work detail. But sometimes they found it impossible for me to get a rodman for the surveys. Without such help I could sometimes carry the rod over and lean it steeply against a tree to get a stadia shot, but the lean tended to throw the distance reading off. And, all too many times I would place the rod against a tree, walk back to the plane table and see the rod toppled over by a slight breeze. I talked Barbara into being the rodperson a couple of times. It bored her and she carried a book along and read while I was taking stadia shots on the rod. Her boredom gave me a better insight into the attitudes of the rodmen. Some of the brighter ones were similarly bored, but many others were delighted to get such light duty rather than carrying out their usual manual labor jobs.

Arriving back on the Inyo NF I was anxious to see the progress on the construction of Convict Lake Campground so we detoured in the two miles off of Highway 395 on the way back from Stanislaus NF on Saturday. To my dismay the campground spurs had no ramps but continued out at grade from the road. This created cuts and fills of 6-8 feet in some cases. The campers would have to become mountain goats to get from their vehicle to the camp stove and table and tent area. In addition, the filled spurs would begin to erode badly as this was a disintegrated granite soil, and the cut spurs would become filled with eroded soil from the steep banks. Our meeting and agreement with the forest engineer was all for naught. This was a serious problem. I was physically sick to the stomach at what I saw—after all, we had reached agreement on how to fit them to the landscape.

I took my problem to Lloyd Hayes first thing on Monday morning and he strongly backed me. We went out to Convict Lake and he was livid with rage at what he saw. Back at the office he confronted engineer Fankboner and then brought the Forest Supervisor into the matter. It was thought to be too late in the year to do anything about it—Convict Lake would be snowed in for the winter any day.

Winter set in and I spent most of it designing and drafting the final plans from the season's surveys on the two forests. Hayes and Fankboner continued at each other's necks over different matters.

Lloyd Hayes brought Mono Lake Assistant Ranger Bob Rice in for the winter to work on the Recreation Resources Review report and Forest Recreation Plan narrative. My preliminary thinking was that the Inyo was similar in many ways to a national park in its needs to handle the throngs of recreationists heading up from the southern California urban areas as well as down from Reno and over Yosemite's Tioga Pass. I espoused the concept of moving many small campgrounds off of the more popular and fragile high country lakes and streams and developing larger campground complexes in areas such as Hartley Springs, Shady Rest, and the Rock Creek Canyon alluvial fan southwest of Tom's Place. These areas would serve as the base camps for day trips to the higher, more fragile, and more popular spots. They would be usable for a longer part of the year, would be less costly and less environmentally-impacting to develop. In the south part of the forest there were no large areas capable of providing reasonable lower elevation camping. However, in those areas there were towns such as Bishop, Big Pine, Independence and Lone Pine which had numerous motels and some private campgrounds and trailer courts which would serve the same purpose as base camps. We got these concepts built into the Forest Recreation Plan.

In the spring Lloyd Hayes asked D'Arcy Bonnet to come over from the Regional Office to see the problems of the camping spurs at Convict Lake Campground, but he was unavailable so we arranged for Recreation Administration Branch Chief Earl Bachman to come over and hopefully agree about the problem and provide us extra funding to re-grade the dozen or so offending spurs. Bachman handled the recreation funding for the Region—"Mr. Moneybags". He was sympathetic but not willing to allocate the funds to resolve the problem. Earl Bachman kept a tight hold on the purse strings.

Hayes and Fankboner began to feud over this and other situations. Lloyd Hayes had a short fuse and tended to say what he thought. He had somewhat of a reputation as a loose cannon on deck. The net result was that Joe Radel had Lloyd Hayes transferred to the Regional Office Lands Staff to resolve the conflict. He had sided with Fankboner at the time. I am sure that there was more to it than I was then aware, but I was infuriated that Hayes was punished and Fankboner came out on top. I was disappointed in Joe Radel and the way the Forest Service seemed to operate—and ready to quit. Lloyd Hayes counseled me to take it in stride and hang in there. He was not at all happy in having to work in the Regional Office Lands Staff, but made the move and in a few years retired from that job and moved to a rural area near Redding.

Later that spring I was detailed back to the Stanislaus NF once more for several weeks. This time most of my time was to be spent at the new Cherry Valley Reservoir adjacent to the NW boundary of Yosemite National Park. The reservoir needed a recreation plan and some individual site surveys and designs for a campground expansion, group camp, boat ramp, pack station, and picnic area. A Forest Service trailer was to be hauled out to the area's existing tiny campground. It was about a two hour drive from the Forest Supervisor's Office in Sonora. The trailer was not in place so we were told to spend the night in the vicinity of the Groveland Ranger Station. Motel or cabin facilities were scarce out there so District Ranger Al Woultee insisted that Barbara and I spend the night at the station. He then showed us out back of to his woodshed on a hill behind his residence. That was to be our motel for the night!

The district was heavily geared to timber management and harvesting, but Al seemed to have

interest in expanding into recreation. He professed no expertise in recreation planning and design and turned me loose and supplied rodmen when I need them for the surveys.

The trailer arrived later the next day at Cherry Lake Campground and we moved our groceries and clothes in. It was surplus trailer obtained with others by the Forest Service from some other federal agency—similar to the trailers set up for married veterans on college campuses in 1945-46. It had seen better days but was much better than a woodshed! The first night found we were not the only occupants—we heard a family of mice scratching around. They occupied a drawer, but we evicted them the next day. We had other wildlife neighbors. A chickaree family shared our camp unit. Their shrill cheeping in the nearby pine alerted us. However, to our surprise they seemed to sleep in until about 10 a.m. each day rather than awakening us at dawn. We'd always thought that wild animals were up and at work at dawn, not lazy slug-a-beds! But then, if they could thrive on the pine nuts and acorns without too much effort, why not sleep in?

Hurston Buck II, the macho, mustachioed District Fire Control Officer, stopped by and told us he would be furnishing the rodmen. His father, a retired Forest Service employee was tagging along with him that day as he was visiting Hurston and his family. Apparently he had held a considerably higher level position than his son. Hurston was rather short in stature, did not have a college degree, and was overly aware of those facts—I'd guess that he had defied his father's advice about going on to college after WWII. He clearly felt that the agency was wasting its money having a landscape architect come out to Cherry Valley for recreation planning and design. Why, he could probably have done that work himself in a couple of days—there was nothing to it as any fool could see! Then, to haul a "luxurious" trailer way out there in the boondocks for such a pussyfoot and his wife was overdoing the welcome. To top it off he learned this youngster was a GS-9—a couple of grades above he who had 20 years of hard-earned and dangerous service under his belt! I could see that he couldn't wait to put me to work on a fireline to learn what "real" Forest Service people had to do to earn their wages.

I had the luxury of being on my own for a couple of days to hike around the west shore of the reservoir and get a feel for its developmental potential and decide on which sites to survey. Then the surveying began. The rodmen varied in their interest and ability to pick up what stadia shots were needed, there speed on moving from point to point, and their ability to hold the rod vertical. It was often a boring task for me, but one that needed to be done in order to get to the dessert—the design work. If I didn't do it, it would not be done, or would be sketchily done by some engineering technician. I made it a point to aim for the best and most accurate site survey on each site—better than the last—as a goal that would help relieve the boredom. I was a stickler for detailed site surveys and often mapped every tree on the site. Without such detail the site design was only a diagram that had to be constantly adjusted when staking out the site for construction. And, it was likely that I would not be there to do the staking. In that case some engineering technician would take the plans and do his best to interpret where things went. Some would religiously follow the site plan no matter if there were obvious errors in locations of proposed facilities. If a proposed toilet turned out on the site plan to go on the spot where a huge old ponderosa pine or glacial boulder was located, that is where they would stake it. Others would consider the site plan to be a rough guide and take every opportunity lay the facilities out the way they would like to see them. The detailed site surveys tied things down and made it possible to do rapid and precise field checks on preliminary designs and to do the final design and drafting in the office in winter.

Hurston Buck did manage to have a lightening fire a bit later after we had completed work at

Cherry Valley and were staying at Slide Inn once again while working on the Pinecrest District. I must have been among the first ones he requested from the forest's fire dispatcher. I had as yet no fire training but that did not matter. It was time that I learned how to use a Pulaski to cut firelines in the middle of the night. After a few hours of waiting around the fire camp in what seemed to me to be a beehive of mass confusion, I was given a squad and assigned a section of fireline to construct and then mop-up later. Hurston Buck led us off in the pitch dark for a quarter mile and then said, "Head up that way until you get to the fire, build a line until you meet another crew on both ends, and then stay put mopping up the fire until you are relieved." We found the fire. I worked right along with my crew. They did not mutiny, so it worked out okay. Fire duty reminded me all too much of the Army—hurry up and wait with total confusion reigning all around. We had no idea of when we would be fed or get relieved, or if anyone even knew we were still out there. When Mac Cready found the next day that I was being used to fight fires rather than crank out his precious surveys and plans, he had me called back to Pinecrest. Barbara felt much more at ease now that she learned I was still alive. And, I preferred the work of a landscape architect to that of a firefighter of being reminded of being back in the Army.

We had a break in this work detail as D'Arcy Bonnet had called for a one week training session—or what he termed a "Landscape Architect Seminar" at his favorite area—Lake Tahoe. It was to be held at the Tahoe Cottage Inn. Barbara and I drove up from the Stanislaus National Forest on a Sunday and found our way to the rambling old red and white Tahoe Cottage Inn. In checking in we found the owner sitting glazed-eyed and mute in the reception area. He appeared to be either drunk or on drugs as he was not coherent and we could not get registered. So, we went to the next door motel and got a room. That night, upon leaving the nearby cafe, we noticed a young black man and a somewhat older man entering. I guessed correctly that they must be the two landscape architects from the southern forests Ray Collins and Vic Shulman. We introduced ourselves and learned that they had successfully gotten rooms at the Tahoe Cottage Inn. Apparently the owner had sobered up, otherwise recovered, or was relieved of duty.

Monday morning at 8 the meeting began. Besides D'Arcy, there was Reginald Miller and Jim Sears from the Regional Office, Ed Carpenter from the Sierra NF, Mel Lieurence from the Tahoe NF, Ray Collins from the San Bernardino NF, and Vic Schulman from the Angeles NF. It was a small enough group to meet in the Inn's rustic common lodge room with its huge stone fireplace. Seated in a semi circle on a couch and stuffed chairs, we listened to D'Arcy espouse on the meeting schedule and his philosophy of Forest Service recreation planning and design. In the previous two years D'Arcy had met here with Sears, Carpenter, and Lieurence who were not trained landscape architects, but the entire crew on hand in those days for such work.

It was quite evident that there was some uneasy feelings on the part of the both the trained landscape architects and the others. Sears, Carpenter, and Lieurence had the advantage of working many years for the Forest Service and a couple of years of experience in campground planning and design, but they were quite aware of their lack of formalized planning process and design training. They were not at all sure as to what to expect from these new college-trained landscape architects. We new landscape architects had the advantage of seeing examples of the others' work and saw no threat in their exceeding the quality of our designs, but we lagged behind in surveying skills and understanding of how the Forest Service really operated. Because of their seniority, they were fairly well assured of maintaining a job in the agency, but they felt that the new hirings of landscape architects might signify an intent to push them out of their present positions which they seemed to enjoy.

Time was split between field trips around the various south shore recreation sites and meetings by the fireside. New standards for site plan symbols were discussed and displayed. I naturally pushed for the type the National Park Service was using—types oriented to detailed plan views. It seemed that there should be greater uniformity in the works of sister federal agencies. So, I was given the assignment of preparing a set of recreation site design symbols when I got back on the forest.

Every evening after a group dinner at a nearby restaurant, we reconvened in the lodge room from 7 to 10 and one by one displayed our past year's site plans which received rather harsh critiques by the rest of the group. To Ray, Vic and me it was not a new or horrible experience as we had gone through tougher critiques in school. But to the others, especially highly sensitive and nervous Ed Carpenter, it was an ordeal that appeared to be designed to denigrate their abilities. However, we all gained much from such exercises—at the loss of not spending evenings at the casino slot machines. D'Arcy Bonnet was not going to be a witness to our moral degradation if he could help it! Ray and Vic had attempted to try the casinos on Sunday night, but Ray was refused entry as he was black! So they both returned to the Tahoe Cottage Inn. This was before the progress made by the Civil Rights struggles of the early 1960s, but even so, the rest of us could not believe such a thing could happen at Lake Tahoe in 1959. But it did!

I figured it was about time to break the ice and start developing topographic maps for the site plans. It would bring the Forest Service in line with what the National Park Service was doing and would make it possible to develop grading plans so we hopefully never had to wind up with the God-awful cuts and fills that occurred at Convict Lake Campground. Perhaps it was a common practice in some other Forest Service Region to develop contour maps but we had no inter-regional contacts that would have let us know. However, it seemed doubtful, as D'Arcy always told us that the California Region was light years ahead of the others in this field—and he probably even believed it himself. It did take a bit longer to take leveling shots or vertical angles on the stadia rod in addition to the distance readings. And it meant that additional shots would be taken in open areas with no features, but it seemed worth the time and effort. In order to limit the complaints of my boss about this added feature of site planning, I converted the raw data to elevations and plotted the contours at home in the evenings.

That spring I was assigned a new Forest Service station wagon. Earlier in the year Lloyd Hayes had planned to order a pick-up truck, but I held out for a vehicle which would keep the survey equipment out of the weather and locked up. It turned out that the Forest Service had a regulation limiting the number of sedans—but station wagons were fortunately classified with pick-ups as “utility vehicles”. It was nice to have dependable transportation, but the fact that I was the only one other than Forest Supervisor Radel, Staff Officer Hayes, and Forest Engineer Fankboner to have other than a pick-up truck, caused some ill feelings among the rangers and others about what appeared to be special treatment of landscape architects.

District Ranger George Tourtillott of the Sequoia NF was transferred with promotion to fill Lloyd Hayes' position. It was a GS-12 job—and the Forest Supervisor was GS-13. Incidentally, D'Arcy Bonnet was also a GS-13 by then—the highest grade landscape architect in the entire U. S. Forest Service. Had he been in the National Park Service in a job of similar responsibility he would have been at the GS-14 or 15 level. But, at least Bonnet was equal in grade to most forest supervisors and higher than a couple of them. It made a difference in his ability to influence decisions on recreation planning and design matters.

George Tourtillott was quite different than Lloyd Hayes. He was about 35-40 years old, a bit on

A Personal Narrative of a U. S. Forest Service Landscape Architect in the 1958-86 Period

the cocky side, and had ambition to move on up in the agency. He was similarly hazy of how to supervise a landscape architect and attempted to hold a tighter rein on me at first but later began to loosen up. The switch from District Ranger to a staff position at forest headquarters was difficult for him just as it had been for Lloyd Hayes. Both had been accustomed to being completely in charge and having the last word on their unit. They had not previously needed to have their memoranda reviewed, revised, and signed by anyone else—and sometime wait days to get it in the mail. Previously they could run their own show, write a letter, sign it, and have it sent out the same day. The District Rangers might listen to staff officers but not follow their directions. This was a frustrating adjustment—after being promoted from District Ranger positions, they seemingly lost authority. It was interesting to sit on the sidelines and observe the painful adjustments. I witnessed many more in the next 27 years as well.

At this time I had managed to survive a full year in the Forest Service! There was as yet no sign that our positions were to be abandoned soon as funding for Operation Outdoors was coming down the pipeline and we were fairly overloaded with surveys, plans, and construction supervision work. It had sometimes been trying, but mostly interesting and enjoyable. Gaining much time out on the ground on the forests and seeing projects through from the site selection to completion of construction and seeing them fully utilized and enjoyed by the public was hard to beat. Not to be belittled was the good feeling about gaining acceptance in the organization—and of being able to help create some changes in attitude about the role of recreation and scenery in the national forests. There was more to forest management than logging, sheep and cattle production, and fire-fighting.

In the following 6 1/2 years I gained more and more self confidence in the job and was completing as many as 16-18 site plans a year for the two forests. There were ups and downs but there seemed to be growing acceptance of having a forest landscape architect aboard.

D'Arcy Bonnet felt he'd help me out while grooming a student from the University of Oregon for a future landscape architect position in the Region. He sent Ambrose Fernandez over for a summer. Fernandez was from Hawaii. He was quite creative, but somewhat erratic and had been brought up in a culture that placed people in definite classes. He felt it was below his station to be my rodman. When I suggested that we switch off and he handle the instrument and I be the rodman, he was unable to do so even with much coaching. He wanted to sit in the office and do design work. I explained that most of the design work had to be held over until winter and that we had to make the most of the short field season for surveys and construction supervision. I did try to slip in some construction design for him but needed him to supervise the placement of boulders, trees and shrubs at the new Mono Lake District Office. I gave him explicit directions on how the boulders were to be "planted" with the bulk of the mass in the ground and lichens facing up so as to appear as results of natural glacial actions, and to get the lodgepole pines transplants set in place the same day they were dug or at least heeled in. When I checked back with him he had seemingly ignored my instructions and several of the trees had browned off and most of the boulders were sitting like eggs on the grass. For some reason he refused to explain why he had not followed my instructions.

Next I took Ambrose along to the Bristlecone Pine Area where Assistant Ranger Karl Tamelar and I were determined to get the flagstone patio constructed at the interpretive kiosk at Pine Alpha despite a lack of funding to have it done by others. We spent a couple of days loading large slate flagstones from a natural rock slide a few miles up the road and placing them in the patio area. This was manual labor and I wanted Ambrose to understand that it was sometimes necessary for a

landscape architect in the Forest Service to do such work. He became upset after a few hours and exclaimed, "white collar people should not do such work!" After that project he found it necessary to return to Hawaii. In future years I successfully requested of D'Arcy Bonnet that he not bother to help me out with such trainees—I could get more work done without them.

However, Bonnet later sent me some advanced trainees to work with for a week or so at a time. They included Chuck Telford who had been hired on the Plumas NF, Warren Bacon who was still in college but working in the summer on the Shasta-Trinity NF, and Bill Sistek hired on the Stanislaus NF. I ran them through the plane table surveying, field checking, and preliminary planning phases. Contrary to my first experience with Ambrose Fernandez, it was a pleasure and rewarding experience to work with such people and be able to talk "Landscape Architecture".

I had grown up loving hunting and fishing and other outdoor activities. I got a deer tag and hunted the first fall without success. I saw does but no legal bucks. Phil Winkel, the range conservationist who had reported for work the same time I did, was also a hunter. The second fall he invited me to hunt with him the first day of the deer season. He was doing a range survey out in the Crooked Meadows country and had seen a good number of deer in that lodgepole, aspen, sagebrush mottled area recently. He had a trailer parked in the area where he would live during the week—coming back to his wife and baby for weekends. I got some groceries and beer and joined him at his trailer on a Friday night before the first day of deer season. He scoffed at the beer I brought and said in effect, that "real men drink whiskey". I got the impression that he wanted company but expected that I was just a "wannabe" hunter.

We set the alarm for an hour or so before sunset and after a quick breakfast he took me out and pointed out a spot on a sage hillside overlooking a stringer of aspen that connected two swales of lodgepole pine while he hiked on to a location that he had figured to be the top spot in which to get a buck. It was a few minutes before legal hunting time. I checked my converted 30-06 military rifle and waited patiently. About ten minutes past the opening time, I spotted a large buck working his way through the aspen, browsing on the leaves as he went. Raising the rifle slowly I took aim and squeezed off a shot. I had gotten my deer within the first fifteen minutes of season opening! After tagging, bleeding, and gutting the deer I sought out Phil. We met along a trail and I told him that I had gotten my deer so that ended my hunting season. His jaw dropped and he went with me to check it out and haul it back to camp. I could see that he was sure it was beginner's luck, but at least he didn't have to show me how to dress the deer.

Phil did not want me to head on home with the deer and convinced me to stay on and help him fill out his tag. I went back to my stand and within three hours got a smaller buck for him. That was enough for me so I headed down to Mammoth Ranger Station and had my deer validated. Then on home to Bishop where I found the freezer plant closed for the weekend. I had to keep the deer cool but it was hot as blazes in Bishop. Barbara and I lugged the deer in through the living room of our apartment and put it in the bathtub and packed ice cubes around it. Luckily, we had no visitors that weekend. Monday morning I was able to take it to the freezer plant where they hung it and later butchered and froze the venison. It had been a short deer hunting season for me and Phil seemed to change his opinion of my outdoorsmanship skills.

I did manage to get into hot water on occasion. The Convict Lake Campground project was being finished off by the Mammoth Lakes District recreation crew. They were to install barriers, tables, fireplaces, and the water system—but it seemed to take forever. I happened to be there on a Friday to do some more staking for water hydrant locations for them. The crew didn't show up until 9,

then all left a couple of hours later for forgotten water system fittings for an hour or two and then had left again before 4. Forest Supervisor Joe Radel happened to come along in his sedan later that afternoon to see how things were going. He was upset on the time it was taking to get the facility ready for use. I mentioned the crew's short hours on the job when he asked why. It was a sore point with me as I always traveled on my own time and got out to the projects at 8 and left at 5 or later. Joe headed right over to the Ranger Station and apparently told someone to straighten out the crew and get the job completed. On Saturday morning Radel was visited at his home by a furious Assistant District Ranger, Ken Chilman. Ken was responsible for the crew and objected strongly to my complaint about the crew's hours, calling it a "cheap shot". I expect he requested that I be kept out of that project and let them alone. Prior to that we had gotten along well but Ken was not very friendly for a long time after that incident. Joe Radel let me know about the rhubarb but said not to worry about it.

At least I was not banned from stepping foot on the district. There were some cases in the Region where landscape architects were so alienated from the district personnel for one reason or another that they were told not to ever come back. And, in some cases the landscape architect's supervisor did not take action to call off the unwelcome mat.

There were other problems. Barbara was active in the local Democratic party and she was nominated to head up the Inyo County group. George Tourtillott read this in the local newspaper and let me know that she had better remove her name as this was in violation of the Hatch Act. I expect George was a Republican—so was I. But, it was incredulous that a spouse of a federal employee was banned from being active in local party politics. Barbara was furious but withdrew to keep me from getting in trouble.

One of my major projects early in my Forest Service career was the rehabilitation of the 200 unit campground at Pinecrest lake on the Stanislaus. The Regional Office had placed it on a high priority as it was extremely popular and although partially rehabilitated in about 1950, it was again beaten down and the tree cover was beginning to suffer. There were only limited barriers to control vehicles on the site. During the site survey I was constantly being asked by lost drivers "how in the Hell" to find their way out of or to their camp unit. The road layout was a large oval with 6-8 unnamed cross roads connecting to the outer loop. The majority of the loop had been built in the 1950s project so was in fairly good condition.

D'Arcy Bonnet was shocked when I sent in a proposed site plan that eliminated parts of the "new" loop and instead, created about four small loops named (Aspen, Birch, Cedar, & Dogwood) off of the north side of the main loop. Not only that, I proposed that the campground amphitheater in the midst of one loop be demolished and relocated across the main road back above the beach. He arranged to meet me on the site to straighten out this errant young landscape architect. We discussed the advantages compared to the restoration needs of the abandoned sections of the loop road as well as that of getting the amphitheater moved, and he surprisingly heartily agreed and told me to draw up the final plans for both the campground and amphitheater.

This turned out to be one of the fastest turnovers from site survey to completed facility I experienced. The campground was in place within a year and the amphitheater by late the next spring. Veteran engineering technician Les Cuff was inspector on the job and we worked out a great relationship in supervising construction. Many of these engineering old-timers tended to give us young landscape architects a rough time on such projects, but Les knew his business while also being willing to pay close attention to requests of mine on my visits to check on things.

One such crusty and stringy old engineering inspector on detail from the Regional Office to the Inyo NF in 1966 was quite a character who had left the hills of Tennessee in the 1930s to work for the Forest Service. He did not get along well with the Inyo's chubby, cigar smoking C&M foreman. I happened to overhear the two greet each other in the office early one morning before they went out to their field projects. Said the inspector, "Gonna rain today, I guess." "Why, what makes you say a silly thing like that—the sky's clear!", exclaimed the C & M foreman after pulling the cigar from his mouth. "Well, back in Tennessee they say that when you see a pig running around with a stick in its mouth, its a sure sign of rain," blurted out the inspector as he darted down the hall and out to his pick-up truck. There was always time for a little fun on the job.

There was also some fire duty on the Inyo NF, but I never became proficient at it nor did that type of operation give me any thrills or desire to pick up overtime pay. I had put in my required time in the Army and needed no more of it. I was once assigned to a crew on a fire in Baker Canyon adjacent to Big Pine Creek Canyon. As on the Stanislaus NF incident, I was tested again. After looking over the fire scene from a hogback glacial moraine ridgetop, the others headed out and told me to take the pick-up and meet them up a couple of miles on the main road. Problem was—the pick-up was parked on a dead end mining road cut into the steep mountain with no turnaround! I managed to get turned around by backing and inching forward to the precipice several times.

This time I was to go in by horseback with Henry Thorne's crew. I hadn't been on a horse before, but had ridden a friend's pony occasionally when I was twelve or so. It was a short ride and we hauled in a pumper and took water from the small stream and got our sector's fire under control in short order. I managed to get in and out without incident—fortunately not having to saddle or unsaddle the horse.

But, a couple of days later I was called down to the Forest Compound and told that I had dented the back fender of the pick-up. I was not aware of any contact when I maneuvered the pick-up off the hillside, but was charged with an accident and had to go through the form filling and getting an accident report on my record.

On other fires I occasionally served as a driver, time keeper, or once as a fire mapper. The mapping was the most interesting as it included a helicopter reconnaissance over the fire with clipboard and map to outline the edges of the fire. To fill in time between mapping changes I would draw up maps and post them at camp as further changes in the line were reported.

On one other occasion I was on horseback while on duty. A management plan was to be made for Minarets Wild Area and George Tourtillott wanted me to assist. He figured that a landscape architect might help develop some new ideas on where to encourage and discourage camping. We arranged a three day pack trip out of Agnew Meadows corral, camping out one night at the Wilderness Ranger's camp the first night and at Laura Lake the second. It was an interesting and scenic trip up into the Garnet, Ruby, and Thousand Lakes area. The aspen were turning and created glorious contrasts with the deep blue lakes and dark mountain rock. But three days in the saddle was enough for me. At 155 pounds I had little padding. I was ready the second afternoon to get off and lead the horse, but didn't want to expose myself to being called a tenderfoot by George. After all, he was only a transplanted easterner himself. But I did have a comeback for any remarks he would have made—he carried along his fishing rod and had tried it out at a couple of lakes—at least once during working hours.

The Inyo NF was fairly littered with archaeological sites and I was always interested in such things. Before my run-in with Ken Chilman, Barbara and I had visited with he and his wife one weekend and Ken had taken me out to an area that former District Ranger Sweatt had removed from a timber sale to preserve "piuga pits" and a couple of wickiups. The "piuga" was the Paiute name for the larvae of the Pandora moth which cyclically attacked the Jeffrey pines in the area. The Paiutes had in previous times harvested the larvae by digging a trench around the trunks of the trees and building a fire to smoke them off of the tree. The piuga would fall into the trenches and be scooped up. The wickiups were used for temporary camps for the piuga harvests. They consisted of branches formed in a cone around a slightly excavated area. No one seemed to know how long they had stood here but they may have been built as late as the 1920s or 30s.

We also took a hike out around the Hot Creek area. Subsequently an archaeologist, Emma Lou Davis, from southern California became interested in the Hot Creek area and Ken and I took her out to look it over to see if one of the nearby tiny caves was worth an excavation. Along one of the rock outcrops I found a small remnant of a woven basket. It had survived in the dry desert heat for who knows how long. Emma Lou did not want it and told me to keep it. That surprised me. When I left the Inyo NF I turned it over to Art Selin who was handling the Mammoth District V.L.S. program for possible display in the visitor center when it was completed. A bit later Emma Lou Davis arranged for an archaeological dig at one of the caves. Barbara and I went up one weekend and helped sieve the material. It was tedious work and very little was found, some small fragments of bone and worked obsidian. But it was an interesting experience.

There were numerous people in the area interested in archaeology and some professional archaeologists from Sacramento and southern California came up to put on a Point Typology Workshop in Bishop. They explained how we amateurs should keep records on arrowpoints found in the area and mark each piece in indelible ink. There was no discussion about arrowhead collection being illegal on federal lands—in fact such collecting was clearly understood by the archaeologists. At another time we were fortunate enough to have Dr. Louis Leakey speak at the high school auditorium. He was involved in a dig in the Calico area of southern California at the time.

Land exchanges in the Mammoth Village area were running strong in the mid-60s as those Forest Service lands were being used by the Region as trading stock for important lands at Lake Tahoe that the Forest Service desired. In order to determine the value of Forest Service lands being traded off, we made it a practice to design sample subdivision layouts and then have engineering estimate the costs of surveys, roads and utilities. These costs would then be compared to the expected sales prices of the various lots. I had been assigned to do a few of these subdivision layouts and it seemed to be a prudent way of approaching the appraisal.

When another exchange of Forest Service lands came about across from the Mammoth Ranger Station, I was again asked by Everett Jenson who was the Regional specialist in land exchanges to prepare a residential subdivision plan for the lands. Since the area was in the heart of the village and adjacent to the villages service station and a restaurant, and since Mammoth was taking off in development due to the Mammoth Mountain Ski Area success, it was obvious to me that the lands would be developed for commercial purposes. I made this point to Jenson, but he said that he wanted me to draw it up as a residential subdivision. That put me in a spot. I could not ethically go along with valuing such land as residential lots. Yet I firmly believed that Jenson would not purposely work to undervalue Forest Service lands. It seemed to me that he possibly had marching orders from above. I refused to prepare such a plan. I said I could not do so in good conscience—

it wouldn't be ethical. This shocked him! He went mumbling off down the hall and then returned in a couple of hours later with George Tourtillott and they told me to lay out one residential subdivision and another commercial subdivision and they would then decide which one to use to determine the land value. They had outsmarted me! I had little choice but to follow orders—yet with a sense of concern about whether the American public would get the true value out of their land. After the land exchange was completed, the land was developed in expensive condominiums and restaurants and shops. I never learned which of the subdivision plans they utilized—but I was fairly sure it was the residential layout.

After about three years on the job, George Tourtillott was promoted to Forest Supervisor of the Wasatch NF in Utah. Roy Feuchter, recreation planner from the Regional Office was selected to replace him. We got along very well—enough so that he arranged for me to get a Merit Award in 1965. Roy was more conversant in site design as he had observed D'Arcy Bonnet in the process of reviewing site plans while in the Regional Office.

As one of his hats included Lands, he was assigned the task of developing a June Lake Subordinate Land Exchange Plan. The June Lake Loop area was one traversed by a road looping off of U. S. Highway 395 about ten miles north of Mammoth. It passed down a valley past June Lake, Gull Lake, Silver Lake and Grant Lake. The latter three lakes were connected by Reversed and Rush Creeks. Much of the land, about 380 acres, around June and Gull Lake was private and mostly developed for residential and commercial purposes. The usable Forest Service lands did not sufficiently handle the future campground and day use needs of the public. In addition, the fairly new June Mountain Ski Area had its base development just below the outlet of Gull Lake.

Roy came up with a plan that would exchange off 391 acres of mostly developable Forest Service lands adjacent to the private lands—even some lakeshore. I asked to see a copy and was flabbergasted. The village of June Lake left much to be desired in quality design. In fact it was tacky-tacky for the most part. If the private land acreage was doubled, as proposed, I could foresee disastrous effects upon the remaining scenic quality of that originally beautiful setting. On the other hand, if the existing private land base remained stable, I foresaw the gradual upgrading of the village due to demand for land. One of the primary reasons for the land exchange plan was to ease the administrative problems of these lands on the Forest Service. To me, that was a travesty. The mission of the Forest Service did not seem to me to make their job easier, but to manage public lands for overall public benefit. And it was clear that all available lands in this recreation area were needed to help meet public needs.

I expressed deep concerns over this plan to Roy and he told me if I felt that strong I should tell Joe Radel. So, I sat down that night at home and typed up a 2 1/2 page blast against the land exchange. I did not hold back a bit on my criticism. I had expected Roy to be upset but he did not seem to be. It occurred to me that the idea for the land exchange might have been Joe's and that maybe he would get me transferred for opposing it. There were no repercussions and the plan eventually fizzled out—at least for the time being. For all I knew, the forest may have been ordered to develop the plan and welcomed criticism that would help to squelch it. From then on I determined that I would take stands on Forest Service issues—to hold back on criticisms of plans or policies would create many problems for me and might not even be in the best interest of the Forest Service. Besides, I had the feeling that too many employees tried far too hard to be loyal to the agency by not questioning what was being proposed or done.

Forest Service employees were treated well by the people of Bishop, but looked upon as a transient

population of low income. Barbara and I experienced this when our landlady of our first apartment announced after a year or so that we were to move out. She had a friend she wanted to have as a nurse and rent the place, and she "didn't expect us to be in Bishop much longer anyway".

After about four years on the job and our first child David was a toddler, we decided to see about buying a home. Barbara went to a realtor and asked about what he had available. He inquired about our livelihood and then said, "We wouldn't have anything that you can afford." She finally found a realtor who was more understanding and we soon took out a mortgage on a nice three bedroom home in the Westridge Manor subdivision west of town. We had seen this subdivision when we first arrived in Bishop. It had been recently completed and was still rather raw looking then. We'd agreed at the time that we never wanted to live in such a tract of similar houses. But now, four years later it looked very good to us.

It took a while to become a part of the community. When Barbara was in the hospital having our third baby, the woman in the next bed asked where she was from. "Bishop", said Barbara. "For how long?" "Almost seven years", replied Barbara. "Well, that's not long enough to claim to be from Bishop. I'm from Bishop. I was born here", was the response. I learned later from a former landscape architect on the Carson NF that from all he could gather, to be accepted in Taos, New Mexico, one's family had to have lived there at least a century!

We had the usual problems in raising children with colds, flu, cuts, and bruises. But then we had a few more. David developed a bad case of pneumonia, then asthma, and another bad case of pneumonia. We made regular trips each six months to Scripps Hospital in La Jolla to have him diagnosed and then treated with medicines and shots. Once when I was out with District Ranger Murphy I received an urgent call to return home as our youngest, Caroline, was in the hospital. I found out when I arrived that she had been diagnosed as having mild spinal meningitis. Fortunately Barbara had noticed it very early and there were no after affects. It was a mild case. But we had some very anxious moments for the next few days until she was released.

D'Arcy Bonnet often threatened the Region's landscape architects by saying he would have them transferred to the Modoc NF. It was the most remote forest in the Region and had limited recreation, but a ranching economy supplemented by logging. Much of the area was sage, juniper and lava rock and its headquarters, Alturas, was a small town. My worst fear was not of being transferred to the Modoc NF but to the Angeles, San Bernardino or Cleveland NFs with their crowded, smoggy conditions and freeways. I had let D'Arcy know that I would not mind the Modoc or Lassen NFs, but would quit rather than go to the southern forests. When the Stanislaus hired Bill Sistek in 1963 as landscape architect, I was freed of handling a second forest. So, D'Arcy arranged for me to be detailed to the Modoc NF. Those assignments for the next couple of years were interesting. I enjoyed seeing some new country and lots of solitude out in the forest.

At the annual landscape architect seminars I would sometimes be kidded about wanting to take over D'Arcy Bonnet's position some day. I had no desire at the time for such a job. I loved being out on a forest and hated the thought of having to supervise others. I received a request from my Department head at the University of Wisconsin, Professor Longenecker, to apply for the job of superintendent of the UW Arboretum. Although I felt honored, I also dreaded taking on such a job with heavy emphasis on public relations, but passed the letter along to George Tourtillott and Joe Radel with a request regarding their ideas of how long my job on the Inyo NF would last. Joe came to me and asked me not to consider that job—the Inyo could use me for a long time, and they may be able to even match the salary. Shortly afterwards I was promoted to GS-11—a first in the

Region for a forest landscape architect.

A couple of years later former forest landscape architect on Eldorado NF, Jim Bennett, who had transferred with promotion to the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) in the Denver area had called me and offered a GS-12 position in recreation planning and design. I was intrigued about it and seriously considered it and filled out a Form 57. I happened to be in the Regional Office on a work detail when they received an inquiry from the BIA about me. Slim Davis called me into his office and strongly counseled me not to leave. He said I would have a more satisfying job in the Forest Service even though they might not be able to meet the BIA's grade levels. I decided to stay with the Forest Service for the time being. The Federal Highway Administration was also offering many new high-graded positions and it looked as if there would be many opportunities in the future in federal fields.

Over the years, I had been assigned the job of preparing site surveys and designs for many commercial special uses on the forest such as resorts and boating sites. This was a touchy subject since it could be construed as a subsidy to the special use permittees. The Regional Office passed upon the okay to do such plans. The thinking was that many permitted uses were too marginal to expect them to hire a professional team to prepare site plans, and without such plans the site as well as the image of the Forest Service would suffer—and the public would not be properly served. It was sometimes suspected that the permittees were requesting such plans so as to clear approvals for expansion of development and be able to utilize the approved expansions and site plans to increase the selling prices.

After a couple of cases where the special use permit development sold shortly after the approval of such plans, we became more cautious. It seemed that they had outsmarted us and probably had not been truthful. I aggravated District Ranger Jack Reveal of the Mono Lake District when I suggested this ploy in the case of a boat landing at June Lake that he wanted me to survey and replan. I balked at doing the job. One permittee who acted as a rodman for me on a resort site survey also became upset with me when I refused to stop for coffee breaks at his cafe. I did not drink coffee at that time and I made it a practice not accept any gratuities from permittees. He was a sometimes troublemaker for the agency and may have tried to nail a charge against me if he was not satisfied with the results of the site plan. He wanted excessive expansion and continually pestered me on that subject which I was not about to go along with.

Roy Feuchter was promoted and transferred in early 1964 to the Regional Office in San Francisco. At the time he was hobbling around with a broken leg from a skiing accident at Mammoth Mountain. Bob Cermak, a District Ranger from the Plumas NF was promoted into Roy's position. He called me first thing at the office one morning to take him to the emergency room. While staying temporarily in a Forest Service trailer at the Compound, he had tripped on the step of the trailer and he broke his leg! I did so but was astounded to learn that I was charged for an hour of annual leave for doing so! Bob was fairly easy going and became very interested in pushing plans for a Mammoth Visitor Center and amphitheater. I had developed a site plan and Joe Radel was working on gaining Regional and congressional support for the facility.

In December 1965, Bob Cermak, came back to my office I shared with recreation planner Rocky Rockwell and told me that he would like me to come with him to Joe Radel's office. I wondered what I had done. Joe smiled and told me to have a seat. I was being offered the job of Regional Landscape Architect in Atlanta, Georgia with a promotion to GS-12! Winton Rheinsmith had announced his retirement. I was shocked but not enough to think it over very quickly and say I

wasn't interested. It was a supervisory position which didn't interest me and it was in the south in which I had never been and wasn't interested in being in. And, I was quite sure Barbara would share my thoughts about living in the south. She had briefly lived in Alabama as a child. Joe and Bob insisted that I take more time and discuss it with Barbara —that it was too great an opportunity to turn down and that "it was my duty to the Forest Service to take it." Besides, they told me Vaughn Hohfeldt, a former California Region ranger and Regional Office Recreation Staff employee was the new Division Chief of Recreation & Watershed Management in Atlanta and he wanted me for the job. I had met Hohfeldt when he was on a trip with Bonnet to the Inyo NF and liked him.

Barbara and I discussed it and agreed it was not the thing to do, but later reluctantly came to the conclusion that it was after all an opportunity to try to make some changes in the Forest Service's traditional ways of operating. We then had three children and the oldest, David, was five. As time went by we knew it would be harder and harder to pick up and move. I recalled how I turned down the chance of heading up our radio squad in Korea, and then as a result had to suffer for months under a bullying alcoholic who had no ability to come up with any creative means to improve our operations—nor the interest to listen to any such ideas. I also had to admit that I'd been on the forest long enough to get a bit bored when the some of the same old things kept coming up again and again. Besides, I was naive enough to somewhat fall for the "it was my duty" stuff, continued to feel that the Forest Service was on the verge of playing a great role in the development of the nation's outdoor recreation, and expected that they might be vindictive enough if I turned down the job that I'd never have the chance to play such a part in making changes again.

As part of the acceptance of the job offer, I managed to negotiate an agreement that my reporting date in Atlanta would be delayed until March 1. We had a house to sell and the market was slow in mid-winter in Bishop.

During the interim period an avalanche roared down the south wall of Big Pine Creek Canyon and wiped out a concrete block vault toilet constructed during my time on the Inyo. As I had been responsible for its location, the forest probably deserved to get a new landscape architect—one who was better at predicting avalanche paths. And I would be relegated to an area where there were no snow avalanches. Actually, when District Ranger Wilson and I had surveyed the site back in 1958, we had purposely selected a spot outside of an evident old avalanche path—and located the toilet in some fairly mature tree cover to the east. Mother Nature apparently was not pleased with that location for a toilet and, as usual, had her way.

We did barely make the deadline with the house sale and a big forest-wide going-away party was arranged in our honor. A couple of days prior to the party the children caught the Asian flu and it was virulent. Then Barbara wore down from nursing them and came down with it and they all had raging fevers. I tried to take over and then it hit me. The afternoon of the party I called Bob Cermak and explained that I doubted if we could make it that evening. When Barbara and I had temperatures of 103 that night I confirmed our having to miss the party in our honor. Barbara's folks came over that weekend from the Bay area to help get us through the siege of illness. We recovered in time to pack and move. I was down to 145 pounds after that ordeal.

III. In Atlanta, Georgia as Regional Landscape Architect.

Our move was made a few months before there was a major liberalization in reimbursements for moving expenses for federal employees. There were no paid house-hunting trips at the time or other special provisions to soften the costs of moves. Basically, we got paid for the moving van, mileage costs for the use of our private automobile, and about five days per diem. To keep our expenses down and not have to have our furniture placed in storage, we rushed across country in our station wagon with the intent of arranging for the purchase of a house before the moving van arrived. We managed to do so with a day to spare! A very modest profit was made on the Bishop house which we had been making payments on for a little over four years. We had just enough for a down payment on the house in Atlanta. I anticipated that we would be there for many years so we bought a new contemporary style house which we could enjoy rather than a place we would just endure. They were hard to find in the Atlanta area. We later learned why to our regret.

On reporting for work at the Peachtree Street Regional Office, I met the staff except for my immediate supervisor, Dick Cottrell. I was told that he was young and energetic and had not yet moved in from his job as Recreation Staff Officer of the Cherokee NF in Tennessee—and he might be hard to get along with. It had happened that both the Regional Landscape Architect and Recreation Administration Branch Chiefs had retired at year's end in 1965. At that point I became aware that the two had not gotten along well and Winton Rheinsmith had left a beaten man with many scars of having been over-ruled. Within a few months of retiring he was committed to the hospital for mental problems. I also learned that there had been strong resistance in the Southern Region to having the job offered to someone from out of Region—and worse yet from California! Two of their forest landscape architects with similar Forest Service tenure to mine had been interested in the job and the original question was which of them would get it. I suddenly wondered what sort of mess I had gotten into—I should have stood by my original decision to turn down the job!

Soon after arriving our three year old daughter Ann became very ill with an intestinal disturbance and was hospitalized. She was a sad sight with intravenous tubes and restraining straps. Again, it was a trying time, but she soon got well. All three children had by now spent time in the hospitals with serious illnesses.

Ed Stone had moved into the Chief's Office that previous fall as the first landscape architect there since Ernest Walker had retired in 1942. He was about my age and a real dynamo with lots of skills and tact. I learned that although we had not previously met, he had supported me for the job. Ed, a former Alaska Regional Landscape Architect for the Forest Service, also began work with the Forest Service in 1958. He had stopped by Bonnet's office on the way to his Washington, D.C. job and had asked Bonnet about his crew of forest landscape architects, inspected recent site plans, and then inquired about the "Scandahoovian" on Inyo NF. He and Hohfeldt got along very well and he worked closely with me and encouraged me. Without such support at the time I could easily have sunk—and possibly have prematurely followed in Rheinsmith's footsteps.

Stone also set up a Regional Landscape Architects Seminar in the summer of 1966. He tied it in with the American Society of Landscape Architects (ASLA) Annual Meeting in Yosemite National Park. The Southern Region had selected Tommy Silcox of the NF in Texas and Herb Mittmann of the George Washington NF as their participants prior to my assignment to the Southern Region. My temporary supervisor told me I need not go as I had already seen the California area, but he was overruled by Ed Stone through Vaughn Hohfeldt. Our group met first at Lake Tahoe and then

headed down through Pinecrest Lake on Stanislaus NF and on to Yosemite Valley. There was a mix of field trips and indoor meetings with presentations by various Regional Landscape Architects, Ed Stone and other Forest Service officials. I was assigned to present a couple of topics and the thought petrified me. I stumbled through one presentation and luckily the lack of time caused the second to be canceled. I'm sure that Ed began to wonder why he had backed my selection for the job in Atlanta. We were told to spread out at the ASLA meeting and do what we could to show that the Forest Service had interesting work and an up-and-coming force of young landscape architects. I came across several National Park Service acquaintances and was invited to an evening party at the home of the Park Landscape Architect. Ed Stone deservedly began to make an impression on the professional organization and the students in attendance. This made us proud of his leadership.

Vaughn Hohfeldt was very understanding and patient with me. He knew ahead of time that I was painfully shy, but had hopes that I would rise above such shortcomings. Several of the staff were new on the job as Region 7 in Philadelphia had recently been disbanded and the Southern Region inherited some of their national forests and personnel. The newness of the staff and their Division Chief Hohfeldt made it easier to adjust along with many of the others to a new position.

Dick Cottrell soon reported for work. He and I were opposite personalities but we struck it off quite well. Maybe Vaughn Hohfeldt had warned him to go easy on me. He had some very definite ideas on campground design and we did not always agree but managed to work things out. He was, however, open to new concepts and could quickly become a vigorous proponent of them. At times his brashness and harsh criticisms of planning done by the forests caused many hard feelings. I learned to temper my criticisms of their site plans so that he would not go overboard and rip into the Forest Supervisor.

Then there was recreation planner, Jim Wenner. Jim had come down from the former Region 7 with Vaughn Hohfeldt. We lived in the same general area in the northeast suburbs of Atlanta and car-pooled to work. Because of his intense knowledge and interest in the planning process, his curiosity, and his creative thinking, it was a pleasure to bounce ideas back and forth with him and share professional papers of mutual interest. I often suspected he may have wished he had been trained as a landscape architect instead of as a forester.

With all these kind of people to work with, the job was bearable. Landscape architecture in the Southern Region appeared to me to need to be picked up off the floor and rejuvenated. There were sixteen forest landscape architects in the region and I was the only one in the Regional Office. There had been minimal contact between them and the Regional Landscape Architect. They had never had a landscape architect's training session or "seminar" as Bonnet referred to them. I got permission from Dick Cottrell to hold one—provided it was on the Cherokee NF where he could show off the recreation developments for which he had been responsible.

I had been astounded to find that the Southern Region was ahead of the California Region in some aspects of recreation development. They had many flush toilets and had been experimenting with airline and boat self-contained chemical flushing systems. Most of their recreation developments were in top condition and they were rapidly developing large recreation complexes at huge new reservoir sites. In many areas they even mowed the grass in recreation sites.

However, getting accustomed to the southern living style required some effort. While traveling in the National Forests in Mississippi with Recreation Staff Officer Joe Hudek, I learned that it was

often necessary for Forest Service personnel in official cars to select black-operated service stations if they were to get gasoline. Otherwise, in rural areas, they might be ignored at the pumps. This was before the days of self-service pumps. Barbara learned that there were two separate Forest Service Women's Clubs for the Regional Office—a racially integrated one and a non-integrated one. We lived in the suburbs in Doraville on a street composed of a mix of state origins. Possibly no more than 20% were originally from Georgia. Yet, we could sense being looked at as Yankees and when I worked on landscaping our new house, I was asked why we didn't have a "boy" do that type of work. It was not considered civilized for a white to do manual labor. And Barbara was questioned as to why she didn't have a maid come to help with the housework and children—after all a Maid's Bus from Atlanta made daily trips through the area.

Over the next few months, with the help and support of Cottrell and Hohfeldt, we established new standards for site planning and attempted to increase the communications and sharing of information among forest landscape architects. A possible first in the country was made when forest landscape architect Roscoe Moore was promoted to a Recreation Staff position on the National Forests in Mississippi. Next the landscape architect job in North Carolina was raised to GS-12. And, a new position for an assistant to me was set up early in the summer of 1967.

The climate was right for hiring more landscape architects. Some major new reservoirs were being built—especially in Kentucky and Texas. But, it was difficult to recruit qualified landscape architects. I began by checking with the forest landscape architects on former classmates who might be interested. That brought two or three new ones on line. Then I "raided" other regions and got a couple more. Ed Stone had received "Direct Hire Authority" from the Civil Service Commission and managed to train me and get me similarly qualified. It was then possible for me to review Form 57s and have the Region's Personnel Management Staff make direct job offers to landscape architects. This speeded up the process and we got a few more of the top qualified ones before they were snapped up by other agencies.

Not only was the Monongahela National Forest experimenting with the application of clear-cutting in the east, but the Southern Region had now embarked on a similar program in the mountains of north Georgia and in North Carolina. First they had taken selected members of the public on "Show Me" trips to test and gather support for such harvests. They reported the response to be favorable, but the selection of participants may have been the key in gaining that result. Next they had a Regional field trip of timber and recreation personnel look at the sites. After showing us some clear-cuts in north Georgia, they asked for our opinions. I was shocked that this type of cutting was being advocated. I had first seen clear-cuts when steaming into Puget Sound on a troopship returning from Korea and the sight had been appalling. Later, back at the University of Wisconsin I had shuddered as Forest Soils Professor S. A. Wilde had made a case for clear-cutting. I was still too shy to volunteer comment here on the field trip, but when being singled out I simply and quietly said, "They look like Hell!" I could almost hear the gritting of teeth by the timber staff people. It was not what they wanted to hear. I got some dirty looks but no other response. Nevertheless, the timber managers in the Region felt that they had good evidence that such methods that provided efficient timber production and increased water runoff would benefit society—well, at least in the short run.

On that same field trip as we looked over a hillside I had the temerity of questioning the conversion of oak woodlands in the Southern Appalachians to pine plantations. I asked the visiting Regional Silviculturist from Milwaukee who was standing beside me, "But what if the market fifty years from now favors oak?" I got a surprised look and response that that would never happen.

Nevertheless, I suspected that such future considerations never entered the equation. Somehow, it seemed to me that nature maybe knew what it was doing when it decided to support oak trees in a certain area rather than pines.

In California, the veteran D'Arcy Bonnet was preparing to retire. Before he did he prepared a reorganization proposal for his four man Branch of Landscape Architecture. He proposed to upgrade the Regional Landscape Architect to GS-14 and to have three GS-12 assistants, one to handle recreation site planning and design, another to handle landscape management (highway location and design, impact surveys and view area zoning), and the third to head up administrative site planning and design. No action was taken on that proposal at the time but it did get into the Division's reorganization plan in 1969 although it never materialized.

Bonnet called me in late spring, telling me of his plan to retire, and then inquired if I would be interested in his job. He also explained what he had proposed for reorganization. It was easy for me to say yes as Barbara's father had recently been diagnosed with terminal cancer (melanoma) and it was difficult for us being on the other side of the country. Her parents lived in Los Altos near San Francisco. Besides, it would mean a promotion to what I considered the most challenging Regional Landscape Architect position in the country and we enjoyed California and Californians. And, I was beginning to feel that I was up to such a job. When I responded favorably, Bonnet said "Good!" He explained there were no guarantees that I would be offered the job, but that was enough for him to be sure that he would retire in early May at age 60.

That summer the ASLA Annual Meeting was in Atlanta. Ed Stone came down a day or so early. I was summoned to a meeting with Regional Personnel Officer John Sandor, Vaughn Hohfeldt and Ed Stone. I was pleased but not surprised that I was offered the chance to replace Bonnet. But I was also simultaneously offered a promotion in my current position. Jokingly I responded to Sandor that I would take both offers as I could use the double salary. He rephrased the offer and I selected to attempt to fill Bonnet's shoes in California. Being offered the promotion in the Southern Region gave me a very warm feeling and more confidence—maybe I was doing okay after all.

Barbara was aware of the possibility of the job offer so I had not needed to consult with her further. When I brought home the news she and the children were delighted to be returning to California. All we had to worry about was selling the house. It would not be easy as it was a contemporary—and they had little to offer in competition with Southern Colonials and French Provincials in the south. We had built up little equity in it in the 17 months we'd been there and a loss was quite possible. I had landscaped it. First I had broken up and removed the long axial sidewalk from the street to the house. Then I had built a contemporary 2 x 2 slat cedar screening fence in front of the house with a curvilinear walk of varying width from the driveway to the front door. This had shocked some of the neighbors.

The Assistant Regional Landscape Architect position was being filled at about that time. Warren Bacon of the Shasta-Trinity NF in California had been selected to represent the California Region at the ASLA meeting. I knew Warren well as he had once come down to the Inyo NF for training with me and we had again met at our California Region landscape architect seminars. Dick Cottrell took a liking to him and he made sure that he got who he wanted so I don't expect I had much influence on his being selected. And, I am sure that Bacon had the support of Ed Stone. However, the selection of a second Californian for a top position was another blow to the Southern Region landscape architects. At least they got rid of one Californian at the same time! Howard Orr, Regional Landscape Architect of the Rocky Mt. Region was later promoted into my position.

IV. Back to California.

Summer 1967.

Barbara and I took advantage of the new house hunting provisions for federal transferees. We had planned to settle in the East Bay along the new BART line in the Concord area, but the Bay Area weather was unusually hot at the time—especially out around Concord. After living in the dry heat of Bishop and the humid heat of Atlanta we felt a cooler climate would be desirable. So we next looked at the more coastally-influenced Belmont-San Mateo area and wound up leasing with an option to purchase one of the lowest priced houses in San Mateo's Eichler Highlands tract. The house was only a few years old but needed some TLC. It was in the same tract where Roy and Helen Feuchter lived. Roy had been my supervisor on the Inyo NF after George Tourtillott and before Bob Cermak and we had gotten along well. He had been promoted into the Regional Office as Branch Chief of Recreation Administration about three years earlier—replacing veteran Earl Bachman who still lived in San Mateo. Recreation Division Chief, Slim Davis, who was supervisor of both Roy and I also lived in San Mateo, but in a more affluent area in the hills nearer to downtown. We had the choice of taking the commuter train, the bus, or driving to work from San Mateo—and soon BART would be running out to Daly City about a dozen miles to the north.

Back in Atlanta I finished up my on-going projects and we unsuccessfully awaited the sale of our house. Contemporary homes in Atlanta were not exactly hot items on the market. When the moving date finally arrived we had to leave an unsold house with a realtor and pray that it would soon be sold so that we could purchase the San Mateo house. But, on this move we at least had a house lined up in which to place our belongings. The trip across the country was uneventful except for having a meadowlark fly through the back window and smash itself on the tailgate window as we sped along the Interstate in Kansas. Luckily it missed hitting the children, but it made quite a mess.

D'Arcy Bonnet came in for a day on September 1, my first day in the San Francisco office to fill me in on what was happening in the Region and what I might expect. He also explained to me why the plate glass on the desktop was broken. It had happened a couple of years earlier when he received word on the telephone from the Regional Fishery Biologist Al Hall that Regional Forester Charlie Connaughton had just approved Southern California Edison's plans to continue to divert a goodly part of the Kern River for power production. Hall and Bonnet had worked diligently to show that the diversion was damaging to scenic and fisheries values and felt they had an excellent case to increase the instream flow. Bonnet was so upset he slammed his fist on the desk and cracked the glass. He vowed not to replace it but to leave it as a reminder of the lost battle. He had not gotten along with Connaughton even though his boss, Slim Davis, thought the world of the Regional Forester. Fortunately for me, Charlie Connaughton had been transferred to Portland at the same time Bonnet retired. D'Arcy indicated that he had waited until Connaughton was leaving before retiring—he didn't want his replacement to have to suffer as he had. Jack Dienema replaced Connaughton and it was a pleasure to work under his leadership.

Bob Stignani and Ray Collins were my two assistants and Ray Lingafeldt was a draftsman working under Bob's supervision. Ray Lingafeldt was not the typical draftsman, nor Forest Service employee. He wore Brooks Brothers suits and sometimes took a taxi into work from his bachelor pad in Mill Valley. Apparently he had a nice inheritance, but enjoyed keeping occupied.

Ray Collins had been assigned to "landscape management" by D'Arcy. This included working

with the Federal Highway Administration and California Highway Department on ways to reduce the visual impacts of roads across national forests, with Pacific Gas & Electric on reducing visual impacts of new penstocks and powerlines on the forests, etc.

Bob handled administrative site planning—ranger stations, work centers, etc.—and recreation site planning and was the official Assistant Regional Landscape Architect. He provided landscape architect services to the Six Rivers National Forest as well. I had known Bob as an underclassman at the University of Wisconsin. Bonnet had moved him in from forest landscape architect on Sequoia National Forest after Reginald “Bob” Miller was encouraged to resign a few years earlier. Although Ray Collins had seniority in the Regional Office, Bonnet had recently promoted Stignani to GS-12. This had created some more problems, but they were anticipated when the decision was made. Ray was a GS-11. The situation was not the best, but it seemed to be better than what I had first faced in Atlanta.

I found that I had been scheduled for several trips to the forests in the first couple of months. It helped to get acquainted with some of the forests I had not previously traveled in and gave me the opportunity to meet some new landscape architects as well as ones I knew from our yearly seminars. Bob Stignani efficiently filled in for me, but I was uncomfortable about not getting the chance to gain a good grasp of my new office duties. And, the lack of an Atlanta house sale and the need to pay on two houses was a burden to carry at the same time. Finally, in late fall our Atlanta house sold. We lost about as much on that sale as we had gained on the Bishop house. But the load of double mortgages and uncertainty was finally off our shoulders.

A Regional Landscape Architect’s Seminar had been set up for late October at the Redding Smokejumper Base at the airport. Here I had to try to show some leadership to many who I had previously worked alongside. One of the new landscape architects was Gary Brogan who worked under Al Grapel on Eldorado National Forest. Gary was a recent University of California graduate, full of energy, and ready to change the Forest Service. During the topic on sign design, he rebelled at the idea of having such strict standards and remarked negatively on the new “Family of Shapes” sign designs. He was not aware that Chief Landscape Architect Ed Stone had been primarily responsible for that new sign style while Regional Landscape Architect in Alaska. We continued, for the time being, the practice of meetings in the evenings to critique site plans under recent or current preparation. I managed to survive the seminar, although they always took a lot out of me and I later learned to try to schedule annual leave the following week. I absolutely dreaded having to lead topics and run the show, but I knew the meetings were extremely important for both learning and morale.

One of the things I had resolved to do in the job was to increase the information sharing among the Region’s landscape architects. Despite my admiration of D’Arcy Bonnet, as a forest landscape architect I had wanted to know more about what was going on in this field in the Region. In addition to the yearly seminars, I began to send out handwritten “newsletters”. Such things were not looked upon favorably by Slim Davis or any other of my later bosses, Forest Supervisors or staff, or District Rangers. It appeared to them that the landscape architects were setting up their own secretive communication system. I continued to do so anyway. At times my boss would call me in and tell me that someone on a forest was complaining and I should stop writing newsletters or run them through him for approval first. Over the years there were many such warnings but they continued by one loophole or another. A time or two the ruling was that they could continue only if they were official typed letters signed by the Division Chief and included items from the entire Recreation Staff areas of interest. That would begin and then die out as the others never got around

to writing anything. I went back to my handwritten letters—to get them typed would have not only been risky, but would often mean delays of 2-4 weeks. Our clerical staff consistently was unable to keep up with our typing needs. The intent of the newsletters was for spreading technical and personnel information as well as boosting morale.

1968

Since there was no action yet taken on Bonnet's proposed reorganization plan, I brazenly prepared a new analysis early in 1968. A recommendation was made to improve the efficiency by establishing a Regional Office Design Team similar to that which had been established by Howard Orr in the Rocky Mountain Region. In addition, there would be a Landscape Management and an Administrative Site Planning section in the Regional Office. The study again recommended a GS-14 Regional Landscape Architect position as well as a GS-13 Assistant Regional Landscape Architect to oversee these three sections. In addition, it recommended that the Shasta -Trinity and San Bernardino National Forest landscape architect positions be upgraded to GS-12. Up to that time there were no forest landscape architect positions higher than GS-11. The reorganization recommendations were briefly discussed in a Recreation Staff meeting and "Slim" Davis tactfully shelved the proposal. He was not ready to give that much emphasis to the Landscape Architecture Branch. The Recreation Management and Recreation Planning Branch Chiefs, Roy Feuchter and Warren Walters seemed relieved. They had no expansion plans and the establishment of the proposal would have dwarfed their staffs in comparison.

I had arrived on the job in the midst of the early planning of Mineral King Ski Area by the Disney organization. Slim Davis was in seventh heaven in being deeply involved in that project. In the spring he had Roy Feuchter and me accompany him to a meeting in Burbank with the Disney planners. While there we were shown the huge scale model of Mineral King Valley and also given a preview of the plans and models for Disney World in Florida. Walt Disney was dead by then but his brother Roy was there for the meeting. The Disney organization clearly was trying to impress us. Unfortunately, this often worked with the Forest Service, and it probably happens with any agency. But they did have some excellent concepts and little need to worry about costs.

Our role in the project was to help assure minimal scenic impacts—a tough job with such a massive development in steep mountain country. We were involved in it off and on for about three years. Concerns revolved around building design, colors and heights; ski runs and lifts; avalanche control structures; and the new highway and parking structure or cog railway option. This was the first project where we applied computerized analyses with digitized topographic data. It was here that I came up with ideas about a measure of visual magnitude as we mapped aspect to viewer and distance from viewer.

This was one of the rare cases where I was fairly neutral on whether or not the area was developed. The high glacial mountain valley was scenic, but had experienced early day mining. There were other such areas considered for ski area development in the Sierra Nevada that I was much more concerned with from a standpoint of potential scenic impacts. The Disney solution for a parking structure was innovative—tiered into the mountainside at a point with little viewability—and with a landscaped roof and terraces of varied shapes. We did give Regional Engineer Max Peterson cause for ulcers when our visual assessments continued to show unacceptable results for the highway. However, bit by bit, the planning was beginning to fit well into the landscape. And it appeared that it could be developed into an excellent ski area and summer resort serving millions in the future. The Sierra Club finally was successful in the courts in having the project abandoned.

This was a major blow to Slim Davis, the Regional Forester, and Disney Enterprises. With my neutrality, it didn't bother me. Ultimately the area was added to Sequoia National Park—the Forest Service lost the battle and the land.

The Region was in another position of losing land to the National Park Service expansion plans. A provision in the Redwood National Park Bill was that the Forest Service's Northern Redwood Purchase Unit and Experimental Forest would be used to help compensate the timber industry for land to become National Park. The Forest Service fought to retain these lands and published an informational brochure to help their cause. In it they inferred that landscape architects and foresters worked as a team to modify timber cutting practices in that Unit and this resulted in an attractive landscape. I was somewhat shocked to read this as there had been no involvement of landscape architects in that area and I had never been there myself but had heard from those who had that the appearance of the timber harvest areas in the Unit were not worthy of praise from an aesthetic standpoint. In a letter to Assistant Regional Forester W. S. "Slim" Davis dated April 8, 1968 I complained, "What disturbs me is that the public will conclude that if a team of landscape architects and foresters played a part in this 'special landscape management', then it would be better to dispense with such teamwork and seek out other disciplines who demonstrate more sensitivity to the impact of timber harvest." In this situation it appeared that landscape architects were being "used" rather than utilized. Davis, in turn, complained to little avail to Information & Education Chief Grant Morris. It was too late—the brochure had already been distributed to the public.

At our invitation, Ed Stone came out to California for a week's inspection of our recreation sites—the many overused sites in sad condition needed to come to his attention. Ed also squeezed in the opportunity to gather photos for some of his upcoming slide programs and publications. On the San Bernardino NF where Slim Davis had joined in the inspection Ed was off to the side in a campground taking a close-up of picturesque Jeffrey pine bark scales. I hollered over to him, "Hey Ed! There's a tree in your way!" This cracked up the normally staid Slim Davis to the point that he doubled over. It was good to see him unwind for once and have a real laugh. Ed was impressed with the amount of use the Region was getting and indicated so in his report. We had hoped that this would have brought about increased levels of funding for the national forests of California, but that did not happen.

For the November landscape architect's seminar at Riverside I decided to shoot for the moon and involve Regional Forester Jack Dienema, and his key staff. This would give the forest landscape architects a lift—before this we had sometimes had a Forest Supervisor on the host forest give a short talk. Selfishly, it would also relieve me of being on center stage as often. The subject was landscape management. Future Forest Service Chief Max Peterson was then Regional Engineer and was an active participant. Future National Park Service Director William Penn Mott, Jr. participated as the then Director of Parks and Recreation for the state of California. He was at the time rumored to be the nominee for Secretary of Interior. The Region's 24 landscape architects had the opportunity to meet and discuss matters of concern with the top brass. It appeared that they finally were being taken seriously as a needed part of the organization.

Regional Forester Dienema appeared to be very interested in our field and became an enthusiastic supporter. And, after he came in contact with Ray Collins, he gave Slim Davis orders to promote him to GS-12—and it was done in short order. Early the next year Dienema signed a memorandum I had drafted for him to the Forest Supervisors directing them to utilize landscape architects to a much larger degree in "impact survey preparation and reviews; utility line location and treatment; type conversion (of vegetation) location, shape and treatment; highway location and treatment; fuel

break location, shape and treatment; timber cutting modifications and treatment; electronics site location and treatment; and borrow pit and spoil area location and treatment."

1969

Meanwhile, few landscape architects of the agency were aware of all the commotion going on in Washington, D.C. about alarming increases in future timber harvest levels. But, there were intensive efforts to bring landscape architectural skills into timber management so as to soften the blow to the public. In February 1969 Regional Silviculturist John Buck surprisingly requested our help that spring in developing an illustrated manual supplement showing means to reduce visual impacts of clear-cuts. It was to be similar to that which had been prepared in the Pacific Northwest Region by Regional Landscape Architect Dick Bowe in coordination with the Timber Division. Neither John Buck nor any of the Timber Staff had previously shown any indication of wishing to work with landscape architects in the past. Looking back on this event, it would seem that a sense of urgency had developed to counter expected public criticism of extensive clear-cutting and increased national forest timber harvesting.

No holds were barred. A professional photographer from the Berkeley research station accompanied Buck and landscape architect Ray Collins and myself on trips to the Douglas-fir country of Northern California and to the mixed conifer forests of the central Sierras to gather hundreds of photographs and slides of timber harvesting practices early that summer. We were given a crash course in timber management during the day and reinforced by evening get-togethers in their motel rooms afterwards.

Buck and the forest timber managers often became exasperated when Ray and I praised the appearance of harvested areas in which tan oaks and madrone had not yet been removed. They were weeds to the foresters and their presence deterred the reforestation in Douglas-fir stands. Similarly they defused our praise of shelterwood harvest experiments which retained a portion of the large trees during the first timber entry. To them, a good clear-cut harvest was one that had all the vegetation cut off, the unused debris burned to the extent feasible, and the borders highlighted by roads or bladed fire breaks. Jackstraw piles of incompletely burned cull logs and root wads of upturned trees completed this picture. The public looked at such clear-cuts as devastation similar to what happens in warfare. Buck and other timber staffers admitted that some people may not appreciate the beauty of such practices, but that this was scientific and practical forestry, and they needed the help of landscape architects in gaining public acceptance.

On Klamath NF they arranged for a light plane to fly over some clear-cuts so that we could get detailed photos. Ray wisely chose to stay on the ground as there was limited room. The pilot flew low over the clear-cut mountainous slopes and turned the plane on its side so we could shoot photos straight down on the clearings, then banked sharply and returned in another circular flight pattern flipping to the other side. John Buck probably expected me to get airsick, but I fooled him. He also watched from the ground.

Since we had been successful in establishing a design team of landscape architects and engineers on the Shasta Trinity and a GS-12 position there, Bob Stignani applied and got the job. He had reluctantly spent six years as a commuter to the city job and was yearning for smaller town in which to live and raise his family. I selected John "Dusty" Dustrude to replace him and luckily Dusty took the job. He was fully experienced as he had been the Regional Landscape Architect for the Alaska Region following Ed Stone and had left Alaska because of family health problems.

Like Ray, Dusty was outgoing and fun-loving. He was another University of Wisconsin graduate, having finished up a year or two ahead of me when I was in the Army.

On the national scene, Recreation Division Chief Costley and Chief Landscape Architect Ed Stone orchestrated a landmark meeting in St. Louis in early June with Chief Cliff's blessings. It was to be called the Environmental Architecture Workshop and involved high level resource division personnel from the Chief's Office, all Regional Landscape Architects, and Prof. Litton as well as others. That workshop could be rightfully called the birthplace of the Forest Service Visual Resource Management program.

A few weeks prior to the workshop Ed Stone assigned me the task of preparing the paper on the principles of landscape architecture to set up a basis for their application to an objective means of managing visual impacts of Forest Service management activities. It was no longer enough for a landscape architect to stand on a rock or stump and wave his arm and proclaim an acceptable solution. A systematic method must be developed and applied in so far as possible — one that had a sound basis and could be replicated by different people at different times. There was no time to develop such a system before the workshop, and to have done so at this stage would probably not have set well with the participants as they needed to develop a sense of ownership in whatever systematic approach was selected. The paper, therefore, evolved as more of a literature search on principles of landscape architectural design and ecological principles—the idea being that they had to be melded together if a logical landscape management system was to be developed for the National Forests.

I attempted to coordinate with Prof. Litton, but we found that our approaches differed and that it might be best to keep them separate. Next I brought in Regional Architect Harry Kevich on the project to see if he was interested in the design principles aspect. He indicated otherwise. Regional Landscape Architect Herb Mittmann from Denver made a short trip to our office in San Francisco and we exchanged ideas. As we did so his coat pocket was picked of his wallet right outside my open office door! There was no need to worry about Herb ever wanting to work in San Francisco! His office soon prepared the graphics for the paper from the rough sketches I supplied. It was possible to only develop a draft paper and graphics in the short time available. The paper laid out the principles and some hints on how landscape architectural design and ecological principles could work together. The concept of line, form, color, and texture being the basic determinants of visual dominance was one of the products.

After the opening ceremonies I was to present my lengthy paper. Ed Stone had told me to take as long as I needed. Petrified of appearing before this large group as I was, I struggled along with it up until noon when we took a break for lunch. Learning that Region 6's veteran ecologist Fred Hall was in the audience made me more insecure with my attempt to create a logical tie of ecological principles to design principles. I continued after lunch to the finish despite noticing the fidgeting—especially the non-landscape architects—and feeling a bad cold catching up with me. Stone had Regional Landscape Architects Gerry Coutant and Herb Mittmann put on a peppy session immediately after to counter my ponderous message on theory of meshing design with ecology. It helped.

Prof. Litton was far more concise, but also seemed perturbed at how things were going. Being a cautious researcher, he was probably concerned that the information gathered for this workshop was untested and shoddy. He delivered a six page paper on the Principles of Environmental Design. Regional Landscape Architect Howard Orr of the Southern Region developed and

presented a paper on the Environmental Design Process. Orr was noted for his ability to develop logical and detailed management systems and present them convincingly.

The workshop resulted in a decision to develop a series of landscape management publications with assignments to Regions for the various subjects. Ed Stone was to be assigned full time to coordinate the work. Each handbook would illustrate how visual impacts of such things as timber harvest, road building, recreation site development, mining, range improvements, etc. could be mitigated or reduced. It was anticipated that it would be a year before the first handbook could be published.

* Discussion on the naming of the program scuttled "environmental architecture", in favor of "scenic resource management". Costley, however, two months later pronounced that the program would be called "landscape management"—an older term that many of us had summarily rejected. I was very disappointed. At that time, the Forest Service was seemingly not ready to indicate that they were managing national forest scenery. Possibly they were fearful that the timber industry might have great fun talking about National Forest "scenery managers and set designers".

Some of the older timber management participants at the workshop were skeptical about the need for, and the results of the Workshop, but within a few months the events would prove them wrong. One of the "line officer" representatives, veteran Forest Supervisor Gibney of the Willamette National Forest, had reminded the group early in the workshop that meeting production goals were foremost in a line officer's concerns. He meant "getting out the cut"—the Willamette was the heaviest timber producing forest in the country.

Since I had been coerced into joining the American Society of Landscape Architects at the time I had my orals for my Masters degree, I had become convinced that a true professional should be a member of a professional organization and work to improve it. As time went by it also seemed essential for us Forest Service landscape architects to become licensed. If we were to be reviewing plans of licensed private practitioners, it would be awkward to attempt to reject such plans if we, ourselves, had not passed the same tests. In August, Ray, Dusty and I took our first shot at the 3 day long California landscape architect licensing exam. We had studied together some evenings after work. It was tough after being out of school 13 years but I passed all the sections except design and irrigation. The following spring I passed design and irrigation and became licensed.

My efforts over the years to stimulate ASLA membership and state licensing among our landscape architects were not anywhere near as successful as I would have desired. There were many excuses but I felt that few were really valid. It did take time and money, but was primarily a matter of priorities.

Roy Feuchter was transferred to the Denver Office and replaced by Norm Weeden from the Southwest Region. Weeden, an ex-Marine, was not especially enamored by landscape architects. I wasn't especially fond of him and his military approach to things either. However, that position was upgraded to GS-14 and he was essentially the Assistant Director of Recreation. Thereby he was my boss when Slim Davis was out of the office.

I was sent off for a week of Managerial Grid training which was very popular at the time. While I was out Dusty and Ray interviewed landscape architect Christine Johnson who stopped by looking for a job. Ray Lingafeldt had resigned earlier in the year to move to Florida. Somehow they managed to get word up through the Regional Forester that there was a chance to get a young

woman professional on the roles and the deal was made to hire her. Christine was a very talented young University of Massachusetts graduate—her creative design skills were outstanding. Norm Weeden was furious about what had happened but had to do what the Regional Forester wanted. Slim Davis, upon learning of the action, was visibly disturbed but said nothing. Out of gratitude to the Regional Forester Ray and Dusty had her prepare a pen and ink poster depicting landscape management. That further soured the situation with Norm and Slim.

By this time Slim Davis figured I was ready to carry out my share of the workload in Recreation General Functional Inspections (GFI). I was assigned the Stanislaus NF GFI and spent a grueling week learning the ropes and being escorted around the forest by veteran Forest Supervisor Harry Grace and his staff and rangers, whose work I was inspecting. I managed to meet the short deadline for my report and felt I had earned my salary with the long list of recommendations I had made for improvements in recreation management on the forest. Harry Grace was a very sharp and outspoken Forest Supervisor. In later years these inspections were less difficult.

I had assigned Ray Collins much of the organizational work and emceed the October landscape architects' seminar in Fresno as it was to be on landscape management and I was involved up to my neck in other things. We had some outside speakers such as former State Senator Farr and an ecology professor from SF State University as well as staff from other Regional Office Divisions. Sierra Forest Supervisor Zane Smith stopped in to speak and attend part of the session. He later expressed his concern about all the effort we landscape architects were apparently putting in to justify our existence in the Forest Service. Unfortunately, he was probably right—it took more of our time and effort than we would have liked.

The environmental movement most assuredly was moving ahead as on November 17 and 18 the state of California hosted a Governor's Conference on the Environment in Los Angeles. The governor at the time was Ronald Reagan — never one to be noted for concerns about the environment. He was already famous for his insensitive remark about redwood trees, "If you've seen one, you've seen 'em all." But in 1969 he was surrounded by a few environmentally literate people such as Resources Secretary Ike Livermore. Livermore was undoubtedly the force behind the conference. The California Region of the Forest Service was represented at the conference by the Regional Forester Dienema, Recreation Division Chief Davis, the newly established Environmental Coordinator, Geri Larson— and me. Things were looking up for us landscape architects. We were being shown in public—sometimes more than was comfortable.

I was invited up to the Klamath NF to the remote logging town of Happy Camp to speak one evening to a local chapter of the Society of American Foresters (SAF) about landscape management. It was a tough assignment. Landscape management translated into restrictions upon clear-cutting and that was not a welcome message up there. Possibly the SAF chapter really was interested in scenic preservation, but I expect that the local USFS members wanted the private sector foresters to know what kind of stuff they had to endure and why it was becoming more difficult to carry on business as usual—"There's the culprit from the 'Puzzle Palace' in San Francisco who's creating the problem! Go get him if you want." I survived—but had probably gained more enemies than friends by the end of the program. I halfway expected to be pulled off the street and beaten up by some of the timber industry foresters when I left the meeting.

Ray, Dusty, and Christine got their creative juices running and made an office layout and then developed an enlarged and imaginative plan for the Recreation Staff. They showed it to me as soon as I got back as some of the other staff had gotten wind of it and there was some grumbling. It was

apparent that the concerns were probably because the plan showed the Landscape Architecture Branch encompassing about half of the total office space. A Staff meeting was called on the matter. Norm Weeden was thoroughly disgusted that anyone would take the time to prepare such a plan and wondered if our Branch was overstaffed if that's all they had to do. Slim Davis prided himself on frugality and was not anxious to ask for more office space and then have to justify spacious quarters with frills such as potted plants. The remaining staff said little but were upset that the landscape architects were proposing to take the best areas with the best views and a big share of the total space. The plan died on the vine. We had suffered damage in interstaff relations and I was in the doghouse for allowing the plan to be prepared—especially with Weeden.

I was learning that having a creative crew had some advantages, but caused friction as well. I tried not to stifle the creativity but constantly found myself having to defend the actions of my group. One time, when advising me, Weeden told me that a certain woman draftsman assistant to a forest landscape architect was a far better landscape architect than Christine Johnson. I was stunned to hear him say such a stupid thing. I told him if that was his opinion, there was never any need for me to ever discuss anything with him in the field of landscape architecture—and walked out of his office.

1970

Since landscape architects were now directed to get involved in anything concerning scenic resources, I wrote a personal note to Recreation Division Chief Davis on January 21, 1970 after having seen the Regional Office response to the Inyo National Forest Stage II Impact Survey on the long controversial Forest Highway 100. This was the Trans-Sierra Highway that would go over Minaret Summit, into Red's Meadow Recreation Area, past Devil's Postpile National Monument, and then through the gap left for that possible purpose back in the thirties when the High Sierra Primitive Area and Mt. Dana-Minarets Wild Area had been established. Since the Wilderness Bill of 1964 they were known as the John Muir Wilderness and the Minarets Wilderness.

The Division of Recreation had reviewed the Impact Survey and responded in writing, questioning the need for the proposed first leg of this major highway which would terminate in Red's Meadow Recreation Area. Curiously, the official Regional Office response to the forest was favorable. The Recreation Staff seemingly had been ignored.

Behind the scenes there was strong political support for the highway from agricultural interests in the San Joaquin Valley who wanted a short cut through the Sierras for the shipping of produce east. Yet though there was some minor support on the Inyo National Forest from both Forest Service personnel and local residents, most of the sentiment was against turning this unique scenic corridor into a major transcontinental route.

My two-page personal note to my boss, Slim Davis complained of what appeared to be the ignoring of the Recreation Division's response as well as an almost complete lack of landscape architectural analyses of the visual impacts of such a highway on the major recreation area, Devil's Postpile National Monument and two major Wilderness areas. Davis passing this note on up to Deputy Regional Forester Charlie Yates, and he in turn, passed it on to Regional Forester Jack Dienema. Dienema instructed Regional Engineer Max Peterson to meet with Davis and myself. The result was that the Landscape Architecture Branch was given the green light to prepare a visual analysis of the potential impacts of the project. As a beginning, three of us were flown over to

Mammoth Lakes Airport in a FS plane and made a snowcat trip up to Minaret Summit to personally inspect the route and take both aerial and ground-based photographs.

Also, in the far northeast of the state the state highway engineers had proposed four-laning of a portion of the scenic Smith River Canyon near the Oregon border. This narrow, winding canyon was noted for its premier steelhead and salmon fishing as well as its fragile soils. A few years previous a new highway in the canyon had been heavily damaged by a flood only three years after it was constructed. Regional Landscape Architect D'Arcy Bonnet had lost a battle on that earlier road design in which he had warned that the road fill would probably end up in the ocean. Much of it did! As his replacement I decided to use the new tools of computer analyses to better illustrate the visual impacts of additional construction on this sensitive travel corridor.

The agreement to pursue a visual analysis occurred subsequent to a memorandum I wrote "To the Files" containing critical comments on what seemed to be planned for this \$3-5-million-dollar-per-mile highway. This occurred after a field trip I made to the area in February with Ray Collins. Memoranda written "To the Files" were often frowned upon as they were a means of making what otherwise would be an unofficial note into an official document. In many cases they were used by the author to protect what might be a minority opinion or to have a record of their position in the files if later decisions might be dependent on such information. D'Arcy Bonnet had taught me that sometimes it would be necessary to write such memoranda.

"Slim" Davis routed a copy to Regional Engineer Max Peterson for information. Max responded with a long typewritten note, demanding among other things that my memorandum be revised, that "significant conclusions" were reached after only a "windshield cruise" of the area, and that there was no need for "more emotional statements of opinion based on limited observation." A major concern was that a General Integrating Inspection of the Six Rivers NF had just recently been completed and it concluded that the highway project was acceptable. Peterson emphasized that at such a decision point, "each technical person is then obligated to give his best talents toward helping accomplish the decision reached." That may have been the proper way to operate a military unit, I always felt that my loyalty to the land and my profession was more important than my loyalty to an employer.

Upon firm direction from Davis to avoid conflict by revising the memorandum, I prepared a second letter "To the Files" with some added and deleted sentences from that of the first, but no change in level of concern about the potential visual impacts of the project. I also estimated that the cost of a visual analysis would be only 1/4 of one percent of the cost of a single mile of highway. I then left the original letter in the files instead of the normal procedure of destroying it. I was beginning to learn that there were sometimes efforts to whitewash the file content to benefit the agency position.

Ed Stone needed help on the the landscape management series of booklets. He had previously had Regional Landscape Architect Howard Orr and Region 4's graphics expert forest landscape architect Norm Malone working on the first volume handbook. Since I had researched the paper at the St. Louis meeting on the subject, he called me in for a detail to continue the work while also bringing in Don Winslow, Assistant Regional Landscape Architect from the Southwest Region to work on the Roads Chapter. Don and I arrived in late April and were given office space across the street in the old Auditor's Building from the USDA South Building where the Forest Service was located. We had lots of privacy in the empty old relic, but had to duck occasionally when pieces of plaster and paint dropped off the ceiling! We made progress in the peace and quiet between plaster

drops.

While in the DC area, I took the opportunity to ride down to Colonial Williamsburg for our annual meeting and the ASLA Annual Meeting with Ed and Diane Stone. There happened to be two Ed Stones in the ASLA. Ed Stone, II, was the Chief Landscape Architect for the Forest Service. The other, Ed Stone, Jr., had a large private office practice in Florida—the son of famous architect Edward Durell Stone. At about 6 a.m. one morning Diane Stone sleepily answered the phone. A woman said she must have the wrong number as she wanted Ed Stone. Diane said it was the right number and would put Ed on the line. The woman icily replied that she was Mrs. Ed Stone, no longer wanted to talk to him and hung up. Otherwise the meetings went fine.

Meanwhile, Dusty, Christine, and Ray had met the April 30 target and completed the "Visual Impact Study-Minaret Summit Highway" when I returned from the detail to the Chief's Office. It concluded that the visual impact of the project "is of such magnitude that the study group recommends against approval of the present preliminary plans. . . . Scars would be visible from as far away as 25 miles." The study recommended revisions in grade and alignment, decreasing the width of the highway from 46 to 30 feet, and almost a continuous retaining wall to avoid fill slopes then planned as high as 100 feet. It was predicted that such efforts could reduce the visual impact 60-70 percent, but would be more costly due to the amount of retaining walls required. Another alternative proposed was a continuous viaduct section for a major part of the route, an expensive solution.

Shortly after this California Supreme Court Judge Raymond Sherwin, President of the Sierra Club, called me to request a copy of the study. I had to clear the request through Regional Engineer Max Peterson. It troubled me that the request was then denied on the basis that this was an administrative study rather than a public report. It would not be a good thing to let the road opponents know that there was an internal battle going on.

A Servicewide Meeting on Silviculture was held in October in the California Region. A primary purpose of the field trip was to view the roadside landscape management of timber harvests on Stanislaus National Forest. On this heavy recreational use forest, a progressive Timber Management Officer, Barney Sweatt, had done an outstanding job of selective timber harvest along the major highways in the middle elevations of the Sierra Nevada. Sweatt was basically a sensitive forester and had experienced the Deadman timber harvest controversy on the Mammoth District Inyo National Forest in the mid-1950s where he was then District Ranger. Sweatt did not wish to go through another battle with the Sierra Club and other concerned people and groups so he insisted on an unusual degree of attention to the appearance of the roadside timber harvests. The continuing push to get landscape architects involved caused Assistant Chief Landscape Architect Duane Lyon and I to be invited to participate in the field trip as observers. Although there was agreement that the Stanislaus National Forest had done a good job of light cutting and cleanup, it was clear from the questions asked and the conversations off to the side that many of the participants viewed this project as only a showcase. They seemed to agree it was possibly needed in parts of California, but did not feel that economics would justify it for other areas of the country.

By the following month I was called to the Angeles NF where the Forest Supervisor was having a run-in with his landscape architect and the Recreation Staff Officer was dutifully siding with his boss. This was another case of a too creative and aggressive young landscape architect running headlong into conservative traditionalists. But there was no question as to who would eventually win out. I met at length with the Forest Supervisor and Recreation Staff Officer trying to gather

the facts and attempt to arbitrate the situation. Serious but very speculative accusations were made against the landscape architect. It appeared to me that it was simply a matter of a personality clash with he and the Forest Supervisor---both short and feisty. I made a plea to the Forest Supervisor for working the problem out, but received few signs of such intent. Then for a couple of days I traveled in the field with the landscape architect counseling him to back off a bit as data was being developed to justify firing him. He managed to remain on the forest another year before finding himself a transfer north. There were numerous cases over the years where I was called upon to work out problems of forests with their landscape architects. All were difficult, but this was the most desperate situation.

Another blow landed late in 1970 when Dusty informed me that he was resigning and moving to the San Juan Islands in Puget Sound. He had been doing an excellent job even though his creativity and non-traditionalist ways sometimes got me in trouble. I wondered if I had reacted by putting too tight reigns upon him but he indicated otherwise---he had made an inspection on the Modoc NF and was "turned on" by the wide open spaces and rural life style. He began to wonder what he was doing to his sons by having them grow up in the midst of San Francisco whereas he had a great childhood in rural Wisconsin. Finally, the family had just returned from vacationing in the Northwest and found the San Juan Island "paradise".

1971

Getting replacements for Regional Office positions was not always easy, but Art Dreyer on the Shasta-Trinity Design Team liked the Bay Area and accepted the Assistant Regional Landscape Architect position. I knew that he was another creative person and I would have to continue to shield off the displeasures of Norm Weeden and the sometimes scowls of Slim Davis over the way in which such individuals operated. At the time Art's political conservatism was being abandoned in favor of 1960s style liberalism--- he was in the process of being reformed. That sometimes put even Ray and myself to the right of him, the opposite of what we were accustomed.

In late February 1971 the California Region held an Environmental Management Seminar in San Diego bringing in speakers from the Sierra Club, the timber industry and private office landscape architects and engineers to interact with an interdisciplinary group of Forest Service personnel. The impetus for the session came from us landscape architects in the Recreation Division of the Regional Office but the Engineering Division saw advantages to leading such a session and took over leadership with Harry Kevich and Leonard Stern doing the organizing. That bugged me a bit but I was at the same time pleased not to have to take on the job---the important thing is that it was carried out. Max Peterson, Regional Engineer and later Chief of the Forest Service, chaired the seminar. Many of the Region's landscape architects had the chance to let their hair down and discuss the issues and problems facing them with the outside professionals.

Soon afterwards a servicewide Environmental Workshop for Engineered Facilities took place in Marana, Arizona in late April. The keynote speaker was R. D'Arcy Bonnet, retired Regional Landscape Architect from the California Region. Bonnet had been invited by Reg Pragnell, former Regional Landscape Architect in the Rocky Mountain and Northern Regions, who since 1967 had been heading up Signs & Roadside Development in the Washington Office Engineering Division. Pragnell had been responsible for planning this workshop and respected Bonnet, knowing that he would mince no words in telling the audience to put some steel in their backbones and protect the environmental values of the National Forests. Bonnet didn't disappoint him! Later, during a panel presentation on electrical transmission systems, an industry speaker left the group with key

thought, "The future lies ahead." The next speaker followed up with a counter thought, "The past lies behind." A Forest Service engineer with a wry sense of humor, speaking on dams and water control structures, referred to the two previous statements and capped this off with, "The present is upon us and we've got to get out from under it." That about summed up the environmental management problems in the Forest Service in the early 1970s.

The controversial Minaret Summit Highway plans were approved by Regional Forester Doug Leisz for the 2.6 mile section from the summit to Agnew Meadows. The potential visual impacts of that project had been changed little since the visual analyses report a year earlier. To me, this was such a disappointing development that I took a day of annual leave and spent it on the Pacific Ocean beach near Half Moon Bay to do some soul searching in order to determine if I could in good conscience continue to work in an organization which would make such a decision. That weekend I typed a two page note to my boss, Recreation Division Chief "Slim" Davis, telling of my disillusionment over this decision as well as others on land exchange plans, special use permit plans and other highway construction plans. In it I said that I could not and would not in good conscious support the decision, and if that would affect my future career or force me to leave the Forest Service, "so be it".

Slim informed me that he had passed my note along to the Regional Forester. A few days later I was called into Doug Leisz's office. I was ready to be told that if I couldn't be a "good soldier", then I had better resign. Instead Leisz wished to know more about my concerns and we chatted at length about them. He encouraged me to continue to question decisions and policies when I had good reason to do so and said, "you're right and you're wrong" on the Minaret Summit Highway situation. He seemed to indicate that he had little choice in the decision due to political considerations.

Later the rumor was that Congressmen Johnson and Sisk had threatened to get Leisz transferred if he went against the \$2.4 million highway. The San Francisco Chronicle published an editorial on July 5 titled, "The Highway That Wasn't Necessary". Leisz responded on July 21 saying that the highway was only meant to provide safer access to Agnew Meadows, that any Trans-Sierra highway was a completely separate matter and assured the newspaper that the highway would "safely and esthetically accommodate existing traffic". In response, Judge Sherwin of the California Supreme Court and President of the Sierra Club, claimed that a paragraph in the draft environmental impact statement disavowing interest of the Forest Service and the Federal Highway Administration in completing Forest Highway 100 across the Sierras had been deleted in the final environmental impact statement. He claimed that this had been done at the insistence of Congressmen Johnson and Sisk whose only interest was for the ultimate highway connection which would cross the famous John Muir Trail which was as yet untrammelled by roads.

Chief Landscape Architect Ed Stone was being given more free run now than ever as he held the reins over a growing group of professionals who possibly could help the Forest Service out of the hole that clear-cutting had dug for them. Stone and his assistant, Duane Lyon, arranged a unique meeting for the Regional Landscape Architects in June in the northwest--beginning in Missoula, Montana with an on-the-ground look at the nearby Bitterroot Valley controversy followed by a chartered USFS DC-3 flight over Montana, northwest Wyoming, Idaho and Oregon to view clear-cuttings. A recent Forest Service-bashing article by Dale Burk in *The Missoulian* had referred to the USFS landscape architects as the agency's "Chaplain Corps". The "Chaplain Corps" was now airborne! One of the Forest Service station wagons used to transport us to the Bitterroot Valley sported a "Chaplain Corps" sign fingered in the dust on a rear window.

After an introductory program to the Region in the Regional Office and a review of the new Northern Region visual resource quantification system, the group went to the Bitterroot Valley and had discussions with the forest officials as well as Doris Milner, a leader of the opponents, and viewed the clear-cutting from the roadsides. That evening they met with University of Montana School of Forestry Dean Bolle and discussed his Bolle Report findings. The following day we boarded the old Forest Service smokejumper DC-3 and flew over the Bitterroot clear-cuts, across to the Teton National Forest with a stop at West Yellowstone. Here we viewed lodgepole pine clear-cutting on flat lands, and then went on to Jackson Hole for another stop to see how a series of clear-cuts on the mountains had caused controversies and were being rehabilitated by changing the geometric shapes to free form shapes with the belated help of landscape architects.

Next we flew over the Targhee, Challis, Sawtooth and Boise National Forests and viewed and photographed balloon logging operations. The final leg of the flight took us across the clear-cutting in Oregon over the Malheur, Deschutes, Willamette and Mt. Hood National Forests. Further field trips on the Mt. Hood National Forest contributed to give us all an intensive course in skyline, high lead, balloon, tractor and horse logging techniques, limitations, costs and visual results. We were now expected to hit the ground running when they got back to their Regions. Ray Collins took the opportunity in his trip report to write a classic—a slightly exaggerated version of the rickety old DC-3 that he claimed to have cowered in as he watched the metal-fatigued rivets pop out of the fuselage and happened to notice in the porthole that Mt. Hood's Timberline Lodge loomed up above that flying tin can that he expected to be his coffin.

A draft of the Landscape Management Basics Handbook was sent out to Regional Landscape Architects for review by Ed Stone. This was to be the foundation for the following series of handbooks that would deal with specific functions such as timber management, range management, recreation management, fire management, roads management, etc.. It was essential that this handbook be tied to long recognized principles of landscape architecture as well as incorporating new concepts developed in the past few years. It was expected that it would be ready for printing early in 1972.

We were in the midst of a massive Water Pollution Abatement Program that caused the Region to replace many pit and vault toilets in the recreation sites. The Inyo NF almost completely converted to flush systems with sewer plants or to Monomatic chemical flush units. There was a move by some Forest Supervisors and supported by Norm Weeden to abandon the practice of my reviewing recreation site plans because of the crush of so many plans, but I managed to hang on to that process. Millions of dollars were being spent and it did not make sense to me to relax standards of review. The thoughtful adjustment of toilet locations and sizes could often save tens of thousands of dollars for a single site. To bypass such site plan scrutiny seemed to be senseless to me.

Over the years Forest Supervisors had often made runs to eliminate Regional Office reviews and approvals of site plans. When I arrived back in the Region one such effort had been partially successful and the cost of the facility was the deciding factor in determining if a plan needed Regional Office approval. Since some of the lower cost sites were for spectacular overlooks and visitor information sites, they were often more important than the higher cost campgrounds. I managed to get that directive withdrawn. Some forest landscape architects were backing such eliminations of Regional Office approvals. I found that it was most often the least talented ones—the top people most often desired a review of their work. They could sometimes benefit by some different ideas and always were able to show off their good works through such reviews. In some

cases, landscape architects had been forced to submit designs that they did not agree with --- District Rangers and Forest Supervisors were not all above dictating design. It was generally easy to spot such supervisor-directed design flaws---and the forest landscape architects were delighted to see them rejected. And it made it possible for us in the Regional Office to keep a finger on the pulse of the field design quality and possible needs for training.

1972

In late April Warren Bacon was asked by the California Forest Protective Association to present his slide program of his version of a proposed visual resource management system to them at Sacramento, California. Since he would be in the California Region, he invited the California Regional Office landscape architects and forest landscape architects from nearby National Forests to attend so that they could see and critique the system and the slide program. Our initial reaction was that of being overwhelmed--- first by his dexterity of operating multiple slide projectors and his knowledge of timber management practices, and secondly by the complexity of the mapping system. Their concern about the complexity of the system worried Bacon since Chief Landscape Architect Ed Stone had similar concerns.

Further study of the system helped to relieve our initial concerns about the complexity. It became more obvious that it was a logical system and to simplify it would be to destroy its validity. It did mean a huge mapping job had to be done on every forest in the region and it would eat up months of landscape architects' time. The alternative was to utilize independent judgments of scenic values on each project, whether timber harvest or recreation development or road building, etc., by employees of varying aesthetic sensitivities. Decisions based upon such personal opinions and arm waving might be less than objective. More and more research being published gave us confidence that we could back this visual management system with well recognized principles of design and public landscape perception research findings. I notified Ed Stone of our support for Bacon's system and it seemed to relieve his doubts. We became heavily involved in reviewing and recommending additions and changes to the system. Forest landscape architect Dennis Holcomb of the Six Rivers NF developed a modified version of a visual management system for a training session. His conceptual thinking later helped in developing Bacon's final version of the Visual Management System.

The Minaret Summit Highway was still moving ahead, but with heavy involvement by Forest Service landscape architects. The concerns raised in early 1971 about visual impacts had caused the project to be delayed for a year. I got deeply involved and by late April of 1972 we had developed revisions in the Federal Highway Administration's (FHWA) designs that had reduced the visual impact to about half of what was proposed 15 months earlier. The alignment had been moved downhill to better coincide with the existing road, the width of the highway structure had been reduced, and the design speed had been reduced. Progress was being made, but was not yet visually acceptable. Just minutes before what was to be our final design review meeting with FHWA in June, we learned that the funds for the project had been withdrawn by the Department of Transportation in Washington.

It was soon revealed that President Nixon had ordered the pulling of the project's funding in response to a request by California's Governor Reagan. Reagan, in turn, was apparently responding to his powerful Secretary of Natural Resources, Norman "Ike" Livermore, who had been a major opponent of such a highway. Livermore had reportedly threatened to resign in an earlier case if Reagan came out in favor of a major dam project north of San Francisco. When

A Personal Narrative of a U. S. Forest Service Landscape Architect in the 1958-86 Period

Norman Livermore spoke, Ronald Reagan listened! That put the final nail in the coffin of the Mammoth Trans-Sierra Highway proposals which had been popping up every few years since the 1930s.

We were not yet experiencing the same degree of public wrath over their timber harvesting practices as some areas, but the Silvicultural Action Plan which came out that summer was exactly the lever I needed to develop a training program in aesthetic sensitivity and the new visual resource management system developed by Bacon and others. We had been lagging behind the Southern, Northern and Northwest Regions in developing such training up to that point. My old dread of standing and speaking to groups had contributed to that delay.

Meetings were arranged with the Timber and Information and Education Divisions to develop an outline for the proposed training program. Next a presentation on the proposal was made before the Regional staff. Another presentation was made to the Annual Forest Supervisor's and Regional Office Division Chiefs in early November. Support for the program from Forest Supervisors was surprisingly strong. Regional Forester Leisz assured us that the program would be funded even though it had not been in the budget. He saw to it that there was additional financing to develop a complete set of training materials, including extensive photographic slides, for each of the 18 National forests in the Region. A deadline of April, 1973 was set for completion of the training packages and the training of two person training cadres for each forest— a landscape architect and a forester, engineer or soil scientist. We got right to work on developing the Visual Resource Management Training Program that fall. It borrowed heavily from the Southern and Northwest Regions training packages and included hundreds of slides in the 3-5 day long training.

That year we had our California Region landscape architects' seminar in a different setting—in an old mansion in Mill Valley where we also had board and room furnished. In line with those times, we had many outside speakers, a choice of sessions to attend, and a great deal of interaction. There was strong advocacy from some of the participants for landscape architects to take over leadership in land management planning. I felt that this was not reasonable and was reluctant to take on more work as it was impossible to keep ahead of things as they were. Being heavily involved in such planning was essential, however.

It was necessary for me to put in a 60-65 hour week as it was—contributing the time as there was no overtime allowed. Paperwork was carried home every night and weekend. The commuting ride served as an excellent opportunity to get through some of it as did the evenings at home and a good part of many weekends. There were many mornings when I got on the train and day-dreamed of the luxury of slipping under the seat and sleeping all day. I may have placed too much emphasis on the importance of keeping up with technical information in the field and thinking that much of the scenic quality of the Region's forests was at stake in these critical times. I expected a lot out of the Forest's landscape architects and felt it was my duty to be able to be as helpful as possible to them in return—or get out of the way and let someone else lead.

1973

In the midst of all this, our Region's Timber Division and Information & Education Division teamed up to produce a slick fifteen page color booklet called "Patience and Patchcuts". It was designed to bring the public around to seeing that clear-cuts were not so bad if called patchcuts and were lobbied for in a booklet. Watercolor landscape scenes of a family standing on a rocky point overlooking a forested mountain with some clean green openings (clear-cuts), close-ups of ten year

old conifers that had regenerated in a clear-cut, a forest scene with a spotted fawn with its big brown eyes, and some wildflowers growing in a clear-cut were portrayed. The section under the title Aesthetics stated:

"There is something exciting about seeing man pit himself against the forest, only to have the forest spring back with more fury than before.

But who will say a freshly logged area is beautiful? To the extent that the ugliness is natural, and to the extent that it is necessary to our survival, we can accept it . . . as long as we know we are assuring continued productivity of the land. PATIENCE and faith will win out. With man's help, the forest springs back.

We do make our patchcuts look as good as we can. We try to make the outline uneven (like nature makes hers). We try to clean up the site (nature doesn't always do that). And where the sight of the cut might intrude on the view from the highway or campground, we try to leave a screen of trees."

Such propaganda turned my stomach. Once again I took exception to what had been done and wrote a personal memorandum to "Slim" Davis, pointing out several misleading statements and illustrations. He was in agreement and passed them along to the Information and Education Division Chief, Grant Morse, who was in charge of such publications. Once again it was too late to make any changes. We had seen the published version and had not been given an opportunity to review earlier drafts.

The contract for the Smith River Highway Visual Analysis was completed that spring by Royston, Hanamoto, Beck & Abbey. It had been the first opportunity to have a computergraphics study and the first for our Region to contract out visual analyses work. Slim Davis had surprisingly backed my request for funds the previous year and we managed to get CALTRANS to contribute half of the funding. The analysis indicated that there would be serious problems with the proposed reconstruction. That study report together with increasing environmental opposition and decreased highway construction budgets in CALTRANS caused the reconstruction proposal to be dropped indefinitely. Max Peterson had been promoted out of the Regional Engineer job by then, but I expect that he may have heard of the result and cursed a bit about us landscape architects sticking our noses into highway construction projects once again.

We managed to get their major training program package in visual resource management (VRM) completed by April, as promised. A week long training session for the future training cadre was held at Redding, California. After three days of lectures and slide presentations, many of the participants were dubious about how such theory could be applied. However, the field application exercise at the end of the week brought things together and into focus. The VRM program appeared to be off to a good start in the Region. Having Regional Forester Doug Leisz's full support plus his appearance and speech in one of the slide-tape programs made a big difference. At times it was critically important. Once, during one of our Regional Office mandatory Awareness Level training sessions a couple of elderly Lands Staff people nodded off and were startled back to wakefulness when the Regional Forester's voice boomed out of the slide-tape presentation.

I was delighted to be able to assist the California Chapter of the American Society of Landscape Architects to prepare papers to get D'Arcy nominated as Fellow that spring. They honored R. D'Arcy Bonnet by awarding him the title at their Annual Meeting at Mackinac Island, Michigan in

June 1972. He was the first U.S. Forest Service landscape architect to be so honored in the 53 years that profession had been employed by the agency. At the time he had been a faithful ASLA member and dues payer for almost 40 years. Bonnet attended our Forest Service meetings at Mackinac as well and was quite overwhelmed by the demonstrations of computerized planning techniques.

That summer Slim Davis surprised us with his retirement notice. He asked me to tape his swan song at his retirement lunch at a nearby restaurant and I wondered why. Slim, who took pride in the fact that he received his Master's degree from the prestigious Yale Forestry School and had met all ten Chiefs of the Forest Service—even Gifford Pinchot, said in his June 22, 1973 retirement speech, "I think good silviculture is something the Forest Service must take a lead in. At the same time though, I have always been critical within our own ranks of the Forest Service policy of clear-cutting. And when I see today how our policy of clear-cutting has discredited us with the public, there is very little satisfaction in saying, 'I told you so.' It is high time we learned that the best silviculture is not necessarily the best National Forest management." Chief of Timber Management Worthington, of the Washington Office, happened to be in San Francisco on timber business, and was there. He visibly flinched at Davis's remarks since "Slim" was noted at being "a good soldier." I realized why Slim had me record his speech and my heart was warmed by his parting shots at clear-cutting.

We had just begun to utilize the computer program called VIEWIT to determine areas visible from travel routes and occupancy sites. The program had been developed five years earlier by the Pacific Southwest Forest And Range Experiment Station. It was based upon a military computer algorithm, but we had not felt it to be an appropriate tool for general usage in visual resource management prior to that time. Now that computer usage was becoming more widespread in the organization, the Forest Service's central computer bank at Ft. Collins, Colorado could handle this complex program at reasonable charges back to the forests. The new visual management system inventory also depended upon mapping of "seen areas". It now became practical to use the program. The alternative was to do the mapping manually which was a tedious and difficult job and often led to inaccuracies.

Training sessions began to be held in the use of VIEWIT. Few Forest Service landscape architects had any previous education in computer-graphics, but before long many of the most progressive of them were deeply involved in application of the program. They began to speak another language—a lunch break at one such session in Pleasant Hill caused a curious switching from "computerese" language to discussion of botanic plant names as many were studying for the upcoming state licensing examination and brushing up on plant identification. The landscape architectural profession was changing in the Forest Service.

Ironically, just as visual resource management was getting off to a running start, our Landscape Architecture Branch was ordered to cut from four people to two. No other group was hit that hard by the cutbacks. Protests were of no avail. The new Recreation Division Chief, Alan Lamb, may have lacked the power to defend his staffing that "Slim" Davis had held with his eighteen year tenure in that office. On the other hand, in the eyes of other Regional Office personnel, landscape architects seemed to be a little too "creative" in their office working environment and work habits and too prone to criticize the agency's management. We did not fit the traditional Forest Service mold and seemed to march in step with a different drummer. The cutbacks were also hitting the landscape architects in the forests. When a top position was vacated, it was often left unfilled or filled at a lower grade level but the production expectations remained at the same level. A morale

problem had begun to develop just as the profession had reached its highest level of professional input into National Forest management.

Barbara found it possible to go to the College of San Mateo now that the children were growing up and at school all day. For a few years Barbara and I had been trying to figure out how to get some savings for the children's college education and our future retirement needs. I had tried out the stock market and did okay at first and then managed to lose the meager earnings and more. Barbara suggested we'd be better off investing in something we understood—upgrading of houses and gardens. The real estate market was quite good at the time so we looked around and found a large house across the valley from us for sale. The back yard had been damaged by a soil slippage, there had been a small lawsuit, and the owners had moved out of town. I studied the soils engineers report and it was quite clear that a small lens of clay had slipped down the hill and that is all that was left to slip. We put our home on the market and sold it quickly. With the proceeds it was possible to make a down payment on the larger house and a house in nearby Foster City to fix up a bit and rent out. We could do such improvement work and see quick and solid results. Barbara was right.

That fall several Regional Office landscape architects as well as Ed Stone attended a Conference of Landscape Assessment at the University of Massachusetts at Amherst. It represented the first opportunity for a national gathering and presentation of papers on this newly opening field. It helped open some new avenues for the Forest Service's visual resource management program. I presented a paper on a proposed model for assessing visual resources. Once again, I shuddered at the task of speaking, but knew I was committed to do so. A few months earlier Prof. Fabos of the University of Massachusetts had contacted me requesting my participation and offering to pay travel costs, meals and hotel room. I was too honored to refuse. The papers were later published in the book, *Landscape Assessment*.

Soon after, Ron Walters and Warren Bacon of the Pacific Northwest led an effort in which Ray Collins and I, along with Gary Elsner, Burt Litton, and Charles Schwarz of the Pacific Southwest Range & Experiment Station in Berkeley, worked with Dr. Robert Lee, sociologist of the University of California Forestry School to determine means to strengthen the Sensitivity Levels section of the Visual Management System. It was the weakest part of the system. The contracted effort with Dr. Lee and his graduate assistant Bob Ewing was long and frustrating, but not very successful.

Meanwhile Dr. Ron Boster and Dr. Terry Daniels of the Rocky Mountain Forest and Range Experiment Station out of Tucson were working with the Coconino National Forest on the development of a Scenic Beauty Estimation (SBE) system. Boster, as a part of this study, tested the Regional Landscape Architects and others for landscape preferences with a series of slides of the landscape at our annual meeting in Memphis in late June of 1974. Their studies were based upon detailed views of foreground landscapes rather than the broader context of middlegrounds which were considered of prime importance by many of the Forest Service practitioners in scenic resource management. I could not get excited about its potential as a working tool on the forests. Their SBE system went on to become a well recognized research tool, but I continued to wonder if we had given it a fair trial.

Late in the year we began to supplement The Visual Management System with "visual absorption capability"(VAC) inventories. I was aware of pioneering work in this field by Jacobs and Way at Harvard Graduate School of Design in the late 1960s and its utilization by Forest Service landscape

architects Jim Knode and Wayne Tlusty (Harvard graduates) in the Alaska Region in the early 1970s. This inventory added the dimension of how difficult and/or costly it might be to harvest timber, build new roads, build utility lines, etc. and yet meet the Visual Quality Objectives (VQOs).

In certain cases, it had been found that the simplistic approach of locating such activities in the least restrictive VQO areas was not the best solution. Often those areas also had low visual absorption capability—steep and highly visible slopes which were in high erosion hazard areas, had soils of highly contrasting colors to the background landscape, had low density or low vegetation cover height, or other problems that made the meeting of VQOs extremely difficult or impossible. With the VAC inventory it was increasingly possible to predict the resulting VQO of a proposed activity or project. This did add another layer of data, required several months of time to acquire, and added complexity to visual resource management and brought about some foot dragging. But it did add to the credibility of the method of analyzing the visual resource and utilized data collected by other professional fields in the process.

1974

In 1974 the workload of the landscape architects in the California Region had shifted heavily to landscape management and land use planning. Now only a third of their time was being devoted to recreation and administrative site planning and design.

We tried something different—three separate landscape architect seminars by zones. Emphasis was on land use planning as it seemed essential for landscape architects to get heavily involved in the process if they were to be effective in getting the Visual Management System into gear. As might be expected, some of them wanted no part of planning—they loved to be designers.

I was becoming involved in other Region's landscape architect seminars as well at the time. Our work on VIEWIT and VAC was of interest to them. It was determined that Art and Christine would have to be placed elsewhere due to the cutback. Ray was not interested in moving and with all his seniority it would not have been smart to force a move for him. The group's morale was very low, and naturally Art and Christine directed much of their attention to finding a suitable new position. It made no sense to them that just after doing a bang-up job of producing a major and well received Visual Resource Management Training Program which was then the most up-to-date and extensive in the entire Forest Service, that they should be dropped. This made things quite uncomfortable for me, but that goes with the job.

In May Barbara and I took our first trip to Europe. Part of the proceeds of the sale of the house the previous year were used for the trip. It was a group tour that allowed us to get acquainted with such travel. I took hundreds of slides—many related to landscape management. We visited England, Greece, Italy, Switzerland, Germany, Austria, France, Netherlands and Belgium and vowed to return on our own. The tour group experience taught us that too many people had waited too long to do such traveling—their health was too poor to allow full enjoyment of the trip.

Job openings were created for Art and Chris on southern California forests but both Art and Christine rejected the offers. Art moved over on a lateral to the National Park Service in June. He was lucky in that it didn't require a move as the NPS Regional Office was just off Market Street in San Francisco.

At the end of June Ed Stone and Duane Lyon held another annual Regional Landscape Architects

seminar in Memphis and we then went on to the ASLA Annual Meeting. At the time Ed was attempting to place his assistant, Duane, in a field position to gain experience. I had considered the possibility of switching jobs with Duane. Ed was beginning to plan for it, but I changed my mind during the course of the meeting and informed him. The thought of working in a cubbyhole office Washington, D.C., and being further removed from the forests was more than I was willing to put up with and the move would be difficult for the family.

Back in San Francisco I was working on the text and gathering slides for the Roads Chapter of National Forest Landscape Management which Ed had previously assigned to me. It was published later that year as the fourth handbook in the series.

In September Christine moved back to the East coast with her husband who was going on to graduate school, and she got a position with the Federal Highway Administration. Now only Ray Collins and I held down the fort.

1975

By 1975 the VRM training program was running strong. Some signs of backlash became to show as it became evident that systematic inventories and analyses of visual resources tended to threaten timber production. Some people in the agency and the timber industry were surprised at the strength that the program had gained by establishing its base in design principles and then developing systematic inventories, some of which utilized state-of-the-art computer programs, to establish visual impact limits. Many had been expecting a less rigorous system that could be traced back to individual landscape architect's biases, and then refuted when necessary. It was more difficult to fight a national system than it was to beat down an individual's opinion.

Ecosystem management training was being held in Ft. Collins at the time. I sent Ray to a session as he had little exposure to that field in college. It would take about fifteen years before ecosystem management was officially embraced for the agency.

Eighteen Forest Service regional landscape architects met with eight Forest Service research personnel who were working on various phases of visual resource management in San Antonio, Texas in July, 1975 prior to the Annual Meeting of the ASLA. We brought each other up to date on developments in their fields and attempted to set priorities on research needs. Only one of the eight researchers was devoting almost full time to visual resource management and the total annual time allotted by all eight was 1 1/2 man years. This was entirely out of balance with the importance of visual resource management at the time. The vast majority of research was tied in some form or other of producing or increasing production of timber.

Chief Landscape Architect Ed Stone received double honors at the ASLA Annual Meeting in San Antonio. He was invested as Fellow of the ASLA along with part-time Forest Service Research Landscape Architect Prof. R. Burton Litton who was also Chairman of the Department of Landscape Architecture at the University of California-Berkeley. Even more importantly, Ed was installed as President of the organization. We had reason to be proud of ourselves. Forest Service landscape architects were now gaining respect in the professional circles.

Costs of landscape architectural involvement in timber management were of concern to Forest Service management at the time. A study in the California Region showed that the visual resources costs were averaging \$147.50 per million board feet of timber harvested. This only amounted to

about \$1.50 additional cost for a typical house using 10,000 board feet of timber. Costs per acre to develop the Visual Quality Objectives for land management planning were averaging 3.2 cents per acre. These costs were comparable to that found in other Regions. Tacking on an additional \$1.50 to the cost of a new house did not appear to be at all out of line. To landscape architects it seemed to be quite reasonable in view of the reduction in visual impacts that such work would bring about. Others were concerned that such costs were unnecessary frills.

Instructions were being developed on the means of integrating the VRM inventories and analyses procedures into the land management planning process, "Unit Planning", which was now in full swing. By October we had worked out a process to fit into their Region's nine step planning process. In many ways, the VRM integration fit into the planning process much better than many of the other resource management programs including recreation, wildlife and watershed. A major Land Management Planning session was held in Fresno that month. I was disappointed in the low number of landscape architects designated to attend.

We sold our house after making some minor repairs and improvements to it and a big job of deck building and landscaping. We bought once again in the neighboring Eichler Highlands tract, maintaining the practice of buying the lowest priced home in the area which meant that it needed work. This allowed us to take a month long trip to Europe in August and early September. This time it was the entire family and travel was by rental car. It was a great trip and the children, ranging from 10 to 14, gained much from it—even more than we had hoped for. We rented a car in Paris and drove to Luxembourg, the Moselle and Rhine River valleys, southern Germany, Austria, Italy, Switzerland and back through France—staying at guest houses or small third and fourth class hotels. The ability to create our own schedule and change it when we wanted was far superior to traveling with a group.

1976

During these years I had been active in promoting Interagency landscape architect meetings with the National Park Service, Federal Highway Administration, Corps of Engineers, California Transportation Department, California Parks & Recreation, and the East Bay Regional Parks. In 1976 we met in Sacramento with California Parks & Recreation sponsorship. We led much of the effort to set up such meetings but it began to fall off with lack of other agency's willingness to set up the yearly sessions.

We went on to make further refinements and additions to the Visual Absorption Capability (VAC) system that fall. Except for the California and Alaska Regions, there was yet little emphasis on this system although there was recognition of its potential value. Meanwhile, Ed Stone had gotten behind the Visual Absorption Capability system movement, and met with Prof. Litton, Regional Landscape Architect Ron Wood of the Alaska Region and myself in San Francisco early in 1976 to develop a draft manual supplement. Both the Alaska and California Regions had developed their own VAC systems. Prof. Litton had written a paper on "Visual Vulnerability". Litton's approach was similar, but its title appeared to give a negative approach to the inventory that bothered Stone. Ed Stone was a "can do" type of person who preferred to be positive. He had little patience with Forest Service Landscape Architects who had negative attitudes. A draft supplement was produced and soon we had VAC covered in the Forest Service Manual 2380 section.

Then, as a follow-up, I developed a Regional handbook on landscape character types and variety class criteria to tie to the Visual Management System. A sensitivity levels supplement was another

project that was completed. Much progress was being made on VIEWIT with the help of Paul Simmons in the Engineering Staff. This allowed us to utilize Defense Mapping Agency digital terrain maps and avoid the drudgery and eyestrain of digitizing topographic maps.

The annual meeting of Regional Landscape Architects in July 1976 concentrated upon interfacing the Visual Management System with Land Management Planning which now was of even more importance pending the enactment of the National Forest Management Act. Although there were some differences in Regional approaches, they were diminishing through such discussions. Since the system had been developed with land use planning in mind, it seemed to fit very well into the land and resource management planning system currently proposed.

Research personnel also attended and the Chief of Recreation Research, Elwood Shafer, said that they would need \$5 million a year to do the job in recreation and visual resource management research that needed to be done, but they got \$1.5 million per year and that is only 2% of the total research budget. Although each of these two resources were said to be of equal value to other resources such as timber, there can be little doubt that this was not reflected in research efforts.

Stuart Calder, Recreation Officer of the Victoria, Australia, Forest Commission had been in the U.S. the previous summer studying systems for managing visual quality in forests and had visited our office. He now began searching for three landscape architects with U.S. Forest Service experience in the Visual Management System as he had selected it as appropriate for Australia as well. Three landscape architects from the Northwest and Northern Regions accepted the challenge and went to Victoria to set up a similar system.

Assistant Chief Landscape Architect Duane Lyon transferred to the Alaska Planning Team while Tom Hagan, Regional Landscape Architect in the Northern Region replaced him and Ron Rhoads of the Washington Office Engineering Staff's Signs and Roadside Group replaced Hagan in Missoula, Montana. Gerry Coutant had left the Alaska Planning Team to begin a Landscape Architecture course at the Ft. Collins, Colorado campus under an intergovernmental agreement with the school.

At the end of the year we sold our 1484 Forge Road home after fixing it up and installing an above-ground swimming pool and deck. This time we moved to the edge of San Mateo next to Hillsborough and close to downtown where I could walk to the train or bus. It was a 1100 square foot 2 bedroom house surrounded by mature pines, live oak and a horsechestnut.

1977

I prepared plans for expanding the house to about 2000 square feet and building began with a contractor doing the main structure. I worked with the contractor when I could take vacation days and did the plumbing, electrical, and finish work on evenings and weekends. Meanwhile we all doubled up on sleeping space. Fortunately, the children did not have to change schools. This ended our moves—both we and the housing market had reached financial limitations. We did later attempt a few times to trade up to Hillsborough fixer-uppers during housing market lulls but never quite made it.

Following a plea to practitioners in ASLA literature by the academic community, I had established a post-construction evaluation program and we were in full swing on that program. The purpose was to learn how well site construction projects functioned after a year or so of use. This provided

feedback to the designers as to what worked well and what did not.

In September we had our Regional Landscape Architects workshop in Minneapolis and each of us prepared two or three papers to present. By this time I was getting more used to speaking before the group and was the senior member.

Barbara took a part-time job within walking distance of home. She was the administrative assistant to an investment counselor. The following month Barbara and I took a 3 1/2 week trip to southern Italy and Sicily. Again we rented a car and followed our own itinerary. It was a delightful trip and we concentrated on Greek ruins. Upon returning to Naples we had the misfortune of having a window smashed and Barbara's purse stolen as we were stopped in traffic. She was so angry that she ran after the robber and almost caught him before he drove off with an accomplice on a Vespa. We lost and had to replace our airline tickets and passports but not much cash.

RARE II was initiated late in the year. The Roadless Area situation was still stewing and environmental groups had found much fault with RARE I.

That year I spent a total of 48 days as acting Director of Recreation. Alan Lamb had tapped me often in those years to fill in when he was out, but this was the heaviest year.

1978

By 1978 I began work on another inventory system to go with the Visual Management System. The crucial measure of the existing condition of the landscape had somehow been neglected in previous work. Yet, being able to show the difference between existing conditions and future conditions was a key part of environmental analyses to meet the requirements of NEPA. The need for such a measure had been brought up back in 1973 at the San Diego meeting by Warren Walters of our Land Management Planning Staff, but it had never been successfully addressed. The inventory process selected utilized the same six categories as Visual Quality Objectives, but to avoid confusion with objectives or future predicted visual conditions, they were called Class I through VI. This required another complete inventory of forest lands and there again was some strong resistance to the added work. Some landscape architects insisted that comparing the inventoried Visual Quality Objectives to the predicted Visual Quality Objectives for the alternatives would indicate such changes, but this overlooked the fact that inventoried Visual Quality Objectives represented minimum levels of acceptable visual quality, regardless of the visual condition the lands currently attained.

A major need for the inventory was foreseen in the Forest Plans required by the new NFMA. Unless there was some logical means to illustrate the changes in the visual quality of the forest landscapes that would be caused by the various alternatives of the Forest Plans, neither the decision-makers nor the public would have a good grasp of the real effects of those plans upon scenic quality. Comparing inventoried Visual Quality Objectives would have watered down the changes as they represented substantial compromises downward in the visual quality in most cases.

By this time Ray Collins was getting involved in the new urban forestry program and I encouraged him as it seemed to be a field in which he could do well. He became known to State Secretary of Natural Resources, Huey Johnson, and Johnson offered Ray a good position. Ray did not get along well with the State Forester and held out for more than Johnson could give him so,

unfortunately, that fell through.

I attempted to get involved in RARE II in the establishment criteria for Roadless Areas dealing with scenic quality, but there was a poor reception to such ideas. I got the feeling that anything dealing with roadless areas and special designations was considered too important to allow landscape architect's input. We might possibly dig up information on scenic quality that would swing the balance and make some more areas eligible for Wilderness designation.

This was also the period of reviewing the NFMA Regulations being developed by the Forest Service. This appeared to be a critical issue to me as these regulations would either give us the direction to fully utilize the Visual Management System or leave it as a minor attribute of forest planning. Comments and suggestions on the content of the Regulations seemingly were ignored by Rex Hargreaves in the Chief's Office. From my perspective, it did not seem that Ed Stone was heavily motivated to influence the outcome. The development of regulations covering an act of Congress was something new to landscape architects and did not seem as important to some as "real planning" on the drafting board.

Because of such a wide variation in visual assessments in timber sale environmental analysis reports I prepared a series of three different levels of sample assessments. Copies were printed and bound and sent to all forests. It helped as was evident in the later environmental assessments that I reviewed.

The Regional Landscape Architect's workshop in Colorado Springs in April concentrated on the Visual Management System and possible needs to update it. I prepared some papers to present at the meeting. However, nothing really got started on an update or reprinting of the already depleted supply of the Visual Management System handbook.

Regional Landscape Architect Kenji Shiozawa of the Intermountain Region retired the following month. Tom Hagan managed to escape the Washington D.C. scene when he replaced Shiozawa. As usual, there were no immediate takers to fill in behind Hagan. Working in the Washington Office was not the goal of most Regional Office Landscape Architects.

Another controversial forest highway project came up—the Gasquet-Orleans road, better known as the G-O Road. It would connect up Orleans on the Klamath River Highway to Gasquet on the Smith River Highway and tap into more timber country. Not only was it opposed by environmentalists, but it passed through the Doctor Rock and Chimney Rock country of Native American religious significance. Although the road clearly was needed primarily for a timber haul road, Regional Forester Leisz made a statement that it would serve as a scenic highway. This was unfortunate as sections on both ends of it had been clear-cut and offered some ugly scenes. Further, the Klamath NF was proposing in their Forest planning documents that much of the area adjacent to the road on their side would be managed for Modification and Maximum Modification VQOs. The Six Rivers NF had proposed Partial Retention and Modification VQOs on their side of the mountain along which the road passed. I found it impossible to rectify this lack of coordination as the Klamath NF would not back off heavy-handed timber harvesting—even though the Regional Forester had said it would be a scenic drive. Eventually the thing got tied up for years in appeals and court cases and the highway didn't get built.

Regional Forester Doug Leisz transferred to the Chief's Office in mid-year. He had been a good supporter of visual resource management. However, his support of clear-cutting and road building

did not often sit well with me. Zane Smith replaced Leisz. He had most recently been the Director of Recreation in the Chief's Office. As such he was Ed Stone's boss. His support of the visual resource management program was fairly strong. I had known him as supervisor of the Sierra NF where he had appeared to be one who spent much time working with service clubs and permittees.

Dr. Gary Elsner and I prepared a paper on VIEWIT that summer and were invited to participate in the Harvard Computergraphics Symposium at Cambridge. It was an opportunity to see what was happening on the cutting edge of that interesting field. On the way back I attended a Recreation Opportunity Spectrum meeting in Denver with researchers and a few Regional Office Recreation Staff people. The system was being re-analyzed with expectations of full-fledged adoption by the Forest Service. Again in November I went to Denver as part of a Task Force rewriting the recreation planning (2310) section of the Forest Service Manual with many of the same people.

Late that summer we began field testing the inventory and mapping of Existing Visual Condition on Sierra NF. It was a "lead forest" in the planning process. After much resistance by many forest landscape architects on the theory of such an inventory it did not appear to be so difficult or complex once we began to evaluate air photos and field check them on the ground.

On October 30, 1978 a somewhat obscure piece of information crossed my desk—Secretary of Agriculture's Memorandum No. 1827. It provided some very concise direction for all agencies in the Department to manage lands with serious concern for visual quality. It was a "keeper"—one of those documents that could be used again and again to reinforce our efforts to justify maintenance of scenic quality. I learned that Sally Shaumann, Chief Landscape Architect of the Soil Conservation Service, and Ed Stone had managed to get the strong language on visual resources built into that policy memorandum. Such work by Washington Office personnel was probably much more important to those of us in the field than they ever realized. I consistently utilized excerpts from Memo 1827 to help maintain a strong posture for scenic quality.

That year's California Region Landscape Architects' Workshop concentrated on computergraphics and was held in Eureka. We managed to get Tektronix to provide 3-4 computergraphic setups and gave hands-on training in computer perspectives to the participants. The field of landscape architecture in the Forest Service had seen some major changes in the toolbox with which to operate! Warren Bacon made a presentation on the upcoming Timber Chapter of the Landscape Management Handbook series. We also got into Existing Visual Condition inventories and there was still strong opposition by some. Assistant forest landscape architect Trini Juarez got so upset that he took over that session briefly as if leading a mutiny. I debated whether to tell him to sit down or let him attempt to scuttle the program. I thought it best not to stifle his opposition, but to let him have his say. With the success of the Sierra NF field testing I was confident that the system was sound and that the complexity it added to the Visual Management System was well worth the time and effort of the inventories.

1979

Early in the year I arranged for a Task Force meeting to develop the Existing Visual Condition Inventory system. It needed to have ownership by some of the leading forest landscape architects in order to be accepted. We worked out the problems under some tight time deadlines. Later that month I prepared a draft manual supplement on the process.

Ed Stone managed to convince Warren Bacon to come to Washington to take the Assistant Chief

Landscape Architect's job. Bacon held out for a limit of a two year tour of duty there and was confident enough not to sell their home in Portland. He hoped to devote much of his time to getting the Timber and Fire Chapters of National Forest Landscape Management published during his short tour of duty. He and Northwest Region Silviculturist "Bud" Twombly had worked for years to make the Timber Chapter an outstanding work in this new field.

Ed Stone had been involved in a task force preparing an Environmental Assessment of the Lake Tahoe Basin. Because of his remoteness from the area and other commitments, he had me take over his role in developing the Visual Resources section. He had been selected due his high level position and this was a high profile project. Yet he knew that I was extremely interested in such assessments and would be motivated to give it the necessary study. In April we met locally with EPA and a private firm working on the project and then went to Lake Tahoe twice that spring to gather more information before completing a report.

That same month there was a major session, Our National Landscape, organized by Dr. Gary Elsner and Rick Smardon, a doctoral candidate at UC-Berkeley who worked part-time for the Forest Service in landscape management research. It drew hundreds of participants from throughout the country and some foreign lands. Stuart Calder of the Victoria, Australia Forestry Commission visited us in the office once again and spent the night with us before we drove up to Lake Tahoe. He was extremely interested in the subject and had hired three former Forest Service landscape architects to help him initiate the Visual Management System in Australia. I arranged for him to tour the California Region after the meeting.

During the conference I had to go to Sacramento to meet with and brief the State Board of Forestry on the Visual Management System. It was important for them to understand the system and if they would embrace it, the private forests of the state would gain more protection from scenic degradation. Lee Anderson, landscape architect on the Klamath NF, was soon selected to work with the State Board of Forestry on an IPA assignment in the North Coast area for several weeks. He did an excellent job as we had expected he would.

By June we had finally developed firm direction on the inventory method for existing visual conditions. The Sierra NF prototype was modified slightly as a result of the mapping experience. Forests in the Region began to prepare these inventories.

History was made in August when landscape architect Wendy Milner of the Rocky Mountain Region was named the first woman District Ranger in the Forest Service. She had worked as an Assistant District Ranger first to gain an understanding of that job. She had begun her career in Portland working under Warren Bacon and Ron Walters. A year or two earlier landscape architect Mike Curran had broken into the District Ranger ranks in Colorado. Landscape architect Jim Hagermaier of that same Region had been the first to do so a couple of years before that.

There were many different land management planning training sessions taking place in the Region that year and Alan Lamb sent me to most of them. Others in the Recreation Staff had shown little interest in land management planning. I made a real effort to develop a comprehensive situation statement on visual resources for the Regional Plan. I continued to be convinced that NFMA planning was critically important, if not sometimes almost hopelessly complex with required use of the FORPLAN computer program that was to analyze economic efficiency of alternatives.

Flextime came into play in the Forest Service and I snapped up the opportunity of working four 10

A Personal Narrative of a U. S. Forest Service Landscape Architect in the 1958-86 Period

hour days with Fridays off. This cut over four hours per week of commuting time and gave me some peace and quiet early and late in the day to get work done.

In September the NFMA Regulations were finally published. The visual resource section had been considerably strengthened with the intervention of Prof. Wayne Tlusty of the University of Wisconsin Department of Landscape Architecture. Tlusty had been involved in a running battle over the matter with Rex Hargreaves of the Chief's Office LMP Staff. Tlusty had much more power to get changes made than those of us in the agency.

We changed pace again in our Region's landscape architects' seminars and held one at Big Bear Lake with the theme of recreation site design refresher. For many years we had concentrated on visual resource management and computers---now back to basic design for a change. Ray and I later in the year attended the Regional Landscape Architects workshop and ASLA meeting in New Orleans.

Other developments in visual resource management were taking shape. Later in November the Pacific Southwest Region again followed the lead of the Pacific Northwest Region. This time it was in the timber landscape management viewshed corridor planning process. The work in that area had been led again by Warren Bacon, Assistant Regional Landscape Architect, and Asa "Bud" Twombly, Assistant Director of Timber Management. They had developed this process while collaborating on the timber management chapter of the NFLM handbook series. Two person teams of landscape architects and silviculturists from timber producing forests in the Region were trained to become instructors in the program.

The Timber and Recreation Staffs of the Region fully cooperated with us in putting on this training and the results of the session were extremely encouraging. It appeared that vast improvements could be made in simultaneously meeting both the timber harvest goals and the visual quality objectives by bringing these two professional disciplines together to apply their expertise and resolve former problems. Each discipline was forced into some cross-training and developing a coordinated solution to a field problem. Through this they learned a great deal, worked together, and gained mutual respect for each other and the often conflicting goals that they sought to achieve. The silviculturists found a new challenge beyond just optimizing timber production and they seemed to enjoy it. They could now apply both the art and science of silviculture. The landscape architects expanded their knowledge about the dynamics of forest growth and were challenged to determine how it might fit in with visual resource stewardship.

Following that training program, the trainers and the participants were enthusiastic about working together and carrying out training on the individual forests. But despite Regional Office encouragement, hardly anything more was done as the Forest Supervisors found no time available to allow such training to take place. That was a mistake on their part.

In December Ed Stone moved up to Assistant Director of Recreation in Washington. He hung on to the title of Chief Landscape Architect as well. Some of us thought that he should pass that title on to Warren Bacon. He deserved it and it might have even encouraged him to stay in Washington longer than he had planned. That would have pleased us.

1980

I was becoming immersed in land management planning as the Recreation Staff's main participant

in the Regional process. In March we finally got our Existing Visual Condition Manual Supplement printed.

During this period there was an active proposal for a Big Sur National Scenic Area in Los Padres National Forest and surrounding Pacific Coast environs that spring. Leaders such as photographer Ansel Adams led the movement, but the developers eventually managed to poison the minds of the local populace on the great idea. Dave Harmer, a landscape architect by training, provided encouragement for the NSA when he became District Ranger.

In late June and early July Barbara, Ann, Caroline and I went to Norway where we had arranged a house and car exchange with a distant cousin for a month. David decided to stay home in order to hold onto his, and Ann's and Caroline's paper routes. It was a delightful trip and we got to see distant relatives, the birthplaces of my four grandparents, and terrific scenery. Barbara soon moved onto a full time job as an administrative assistant in a real estate investment firm in Burlingame.

The Washington Office instituted a computer conference system called LARCHCON with the Regional Landscape Architects. We were entering another phase of the computer age.

Early in the fall I was assigned to a panel of national "experts" to develop environmental thresholds for the Lake Tahoe Basin. It was an interesting project involving a small group of specialists in various fields from different agencies around the country. I was assigned the scenic threshold section. A private contractor from the Midwest acted as facilitator and team leader.

At about the same time I arranged for Devon Nickerson to come down from Region 6 to San Francisco for a day to initiate development of a computer program for the visual magnitude concept I had been working on for almost ten years. Devon was hesitant at first but soon it was obvious that it began to fit together for him and within a couple of weeks he had developed a program and tested the results. This development opened up some new means to readily assess scenic importance and impact potentials. It had not really been practical to do so until the new desktop computers had been available in the agency.

A Pacific Southwest Region Landscape Architects' Workshop in Fresno, California in November, 1980, was set up specifically to address the problem of developing a visual impact model for FORPLAN in land management planning. San Bernardino NF landscape architect Jeff Nonemaker made an impassioned plea to return to the basic principles of design rather than to get caught up in this "if you don't quantify, you don't qualify" syndrome that was running rampant. Although the Sierra NF had worked out a means of correlating visual quality objectives with constraints upon the percentages of clear-cut and shelterwood timber harvests and tested it by Perspective Plot computer simulations, there was much skepticism that this method could be utilized on other forests. Those other forests had more time to develop their data base and thereby had abilities to develop more sophisticated analyses as the Sierra had been selected as the "lead forest" in planning. The workshop was frustrating for all of us and failed to make much progress other than forcing the participants to face up to the difficulty of integrating visual resources into FORPLAN.

The Presidential election results of the same week indicated that tougher times lay ahead for amenity resources as Ronald Reagan would take over the administration in January. His reputation as an environmental leader was dismal. As Governor he had slashed the number of landscape architects in the California Parks and Recreation Department from 52 to 23. We speculated that he

would do the same to federal agencies as his interests in the arts were limited to theater arts. All in all, it was a bad week for this group of landscape architects.

It appeared that the only reasonable method to build visual resources into the FORPLAN program was through the use of constraints to even-aged timber management—clear-cutting and shelterwood harvests. Being in the position of a timber production constraint was not an enviable one. Many foresters were bothered by visual and cultural (archaeological and historical) resources which always seemed to be constraining to harvesting timber and building roads needed to access such timber. It was obvious that they felt that timber was the important resource and that other resource needs were constraints. Never did they seem to look at timber production as being a constraint to maintaining scenic quality of the country's forests. When I once attempted to make this point to Forest Supervisor Bob Rice of Klamath NF, he looked at me as if I had lost my mind. After all, timber was being sold for hard money while scenery was not bought and sold on the open market—scenery was a "soft" resource.

Alan Lamb had me go to a EXAD training session in Washington, D.C. in December. This was the second such USDA executive development training I received. Several years earlier I had gone to a similar session along with Jeff Sirmon. The training apparently "took" on him as he went on to become a Regional Forester and eventually a Deputy Chief. Since I was the only participant from California at the session, one of the instructors asked my opinion on what could be expected of newly elected President Reagan. I told the group that from what we'd seen as Reagan being governor, how he operated would depend almost entirely on the officials and cabinet members he appointed—that Reagan himself had a reputation of being a lazy leader.

V. Attempting to Survive the Reagan Years.

1981

In response to NFMA's suggestion of such measures when it was impossible to place dollar values on certain resources, I developed a Visual Quality Index. That index was developed on the theory that the public placed varying values upon differing degrees of landscape alteration, and that the inherent visual quality of a landscape prior to human alteration also played a part in setting such values. Almost all research done on public preferences for landscapes indicated that a natural appearing landscape was preferred. This held true not only in forest landscapes but in agricultural and urban landscapes. A numerical value matrix was developed based upon that and other research as well as intuitive judgment. It was tested and revised slightly in view of the results of Q-Sort testing of forest landscape scenes.

The Visual Quality Index for existing visual conditions of each forest was then developed by multiplying the acres of visual condition of each Variety Class times the number of acres. The Variety Class was an inventoried level of inherent scenic quality. The same measure was applied to the predicted visual results of each alternative in the Forest Plan. This index then gave a very quick and concise measure of effects of the alternatives and was most useful to decision-makers and the public. Those intimately involved in visual resource management would also look at the tables of numbers of acres of visual resource categories to get similar indications in more precise detail. It became a Pacific Southwest Regional standard for Land Management Plan EIS's.

These additional inventories and documentation of measures of a seemingly unquantifiable resource brought out concerns to managers that visual resource systems were becoming unnecessarily complicated. Ed Stone was among these skeptics despite his wishes to develop the best possible system. He knew that visual resource management was not yet fully accepted in the agency and didn't want to see the landscape architects go overboard and possibly lose all the gains made in the field. He was not alone among landscape architects who felt edgy about the situation. Some of these people were already overwhelmed by the recent changes in their work requirements and the heavy workloads, and some were plainly incapable of mastering the techniques or of producing the necessary volume of work now required. And, others just did not want to be required to apply themselves that diligently to land management planning since they felt that their training and expertise lay in design.

It was becoming clear that young landscape architects needed more career information. How much they received varied greatly by forest and the interest and knowledge on such matters by their immediate supervisor. So, I put together a career counseling booklet that hopefully would help ease the problem. Some help was gained from Personnel Management Staff, but I was surprised at the low level of interest of most of them. This was something that I felt they should have led.

Warren Bacon nearly met his two year target when he transferred out of the Washington Office to go back to Portland and become the Regional Recreation Planner. Ed Stone made an effort to interest me in taking over that job with the strong possibility of upgrading it to a GS-14 and his passing on the Chief Landscape Architect title with it. I expect he made similar attempts with some other Regional Landscape Architects. Eventually it was arranged for former Forest Service landscape architect and at the time the Bureau of Land Management's Chief landscape Architect, Bob Ross, to take over. There was a delay of a few months due to a hiring freeze, but Bob Ross was welcomed into the job in August as our dynamic young hope for the future.

Meanwhile the California Region lost one of its top young landscape architects that spring when Lee Anderson of Klamath National Forest resigned to go into private practice. The forest had not seen fit to promote him to GS-12 even though the Regional Job Complexity Study had consistently shown that it was a GS-12 level position and I had been pushing for it. I let my boss know that such resistance would cause many of the best forest landscape architects to leave the agency and we'd wind up with those who had few options to get work elsewhere.

A small group of us ASLA members were asked to assist the UC-Berkeley on their upcoming accreditation. I was the federal government office representative. We met by ourselves and with the faculty in lunch and after office hours sessions. UC-Berkeley was in trouble and their accreditation was threatened. They had been neglecting their undergraduate program. As often happens, a mature department's professors seem to gravitate to graduate student emphasis—it is more challenging and leads to the potential of authoring professional papers which are needed to gain and retain stature in academia. It was also disturbing to note the lack of interest and follow-up of their graduates. It appeared that many never really became practicing landscape architects. The undergraduates were poorly prepared in the basics of design, graphics, and construction. The graduate students often came from other undergraduate fields and were trained as planners and often expected to begin as planning team leaders. That is not what private sector or governmental offices were seeking. We apparently did some good or were harmless as they got probationary accreditation.

Almost every year we had foreign visitors stop by to discuss visual resource management. San Francisco was a natural stop—especially for those from the Pacific Basin area. In addition, I'd spend time each year meeting in the office, at Lake Tahoe, or at the schools explaining our work to landscape architecture students. In the latter years we were even asked to speak to forestry students on the visual resource program.

After a few months of often interrupted effort and invaluable help from FORPLAN guru Klaus Barber, a method was developed to interface visual resource management with FORPLAN. For me, this had been the most difficult, grueling and often discouraging task I had ever taken on. I probably understood more about FORPLAN than anyone else in our Recreation Staff, but not anywhere near enough to really grasp its workings. The interface was based upon the percent per decade of regeneration (clear-cutting and shelterwood cutting) timber harvest method similar to that which had been employed on the Sierra NF by Larry Headley and Ken Sonksen. It was called the "effective alteration" or "EFFALT" method. Preliminary use of this method on the Sierra and Six Rivers NF Plan indicated that the additional constraints of visual resources, over and above those already used in the past for Water and Travel influence Zones, would reduce timber harvest on the average of 1 1/2 percent. Since most people had expected reductions of as much as 25-40% of their timber harvest levels due to visual resources, the results were surprisingly low. We felt relieved as we'd had heard of the dire predictions of disastrous results of the VQOs for so long from so many people that we had halfway begun to believe it ourselves.

Although the method was developed and individual applications were designed and developed for each of the timber producing forests by the combined efforts of landscape architects and silviculturists, it soon became evident that the actual application of the EFFALT method to the alternatives was often short-cutted at the last minute rush in the FORPLAN analyses. Wider variations than reasonable were showing up between the Forests in the preliminary analyses of alternatives. There was little time or opportunity to dig into the analyses process in detail to

determine if such differences were real due to differing applications of the same method.

EFFALT became the approved method of interfacing visual resources with FORPLAN in the Pacific Southwest Region. Variations of it were applied on some forests in other Regions, but it was not required to be used elsewhere.

As a sideline I had been getting interested in the history of scenery management in the forest Service. I was fascinated with the relationship of Gifford Pinchot and Frederick Law Olmsted, Sr. and prepared a small booklet on the subject. I had purchased *The Quiet Revolution* by Baldwin when it first was published a few years earlier. The trials and tribulations of the Forest Service's first landscape architect, Arthur H. Carhart, were extremely interesting and revealing. I began to dig into more of this history on my own. It helped to gain a perspective of past efforts to manage the scenic resources of the national forests.

We had worked with Dr. Craik of UC-Berkeley's Institute of Personality Research from time to time on his efforts to research people's perception and reaction to landscapes. In some cases this involved setting up groups of Forest Service employees for him to test and compare to other types of groups. We did more of this in 1981. His findings helped us to better understand and predict public reactions to modifications in the forest landscape.

By mid-summer I was deeply immersed in forest plan reviews. Alan Lamb had me participate with him at first but soon turned the job of draft forest plan and environmental impact statement reviews and Regional LMP Team membership over to me. It eventually turned out to be an almost full time job. Since I continued to believe that forest plans would be of critical importance to the future scenic quality of the forests, I felt I had to devote much time to that area. Too many employees were frightened off by the complexity of the process and felt it was only an expensive and time-consuming paper exercise that would be meaningless. They felt the plans would satisfy Congress and then we could get back to business as usual. Such a lack of understanding of the changes taking place in the minds of the public and Congress was disturbing. It seemed to me that a sound training in Forest Service history right up to the present would help prevent such blindness to reality.

At every opportunity I worked to strengthen and expand Regional direction for visual resources in land management planning. There was strong resistance at almost all levels—even from the forest landscape architects as such direction meant more work. And it was not creative design work but often involved tedious inventories, mapping, and calculations. To get changes and additions meant careful preparation of wording of the text, convincing Allan Lamb, the Land Management Planning Staff, the Timber Staff, and the Deputy Regional Forester. There were numerous meetings and rewrites and more meetings on each item. Frustrating as it was, to develop new or revised direction, it was critically important.

A surprise came to me in July when the University of Wisconsin Department of Landscape Architecture named me as the recipient of their first Alumni Award. I suspected that Warren Bacon and Prof. Wayne Tlusty were in back of all this. Perhaps they felt I needed some propping up at the time. There were many other UW graduates who were more deserving. But, as often is the case, this was just a matter of luck—the right combination of circumstances and people at the time.

But all was not land management planning. The age old problem of perfecting privies was still running strong and Carl Westrate in Recreation Administration and I headed up a study to develop

standard designs. The Architecture Group in the Engineering Staff did work with us but with reluctance as they preferred to design a new vault toilet or flush toilet for each project. It made life more interesting for them. The forest personnel all seemed to have different ideas on what features or designs were best and lobbied heavily for their favorites. The lack of consensus dragged the project on for months and years. Toilet design was always a major subject of discussion and controversy in the Forest Service. Everyone had their own ideas of what worked best.

1982

Another landscape architect computer conference system was instituted the first of the year. It was called NEWVIEW and was open to all levels of agency landscape architects on our new Data General computer system.

The lack of care by the Region's management leaders to apply clear-cutting prescriptions in the Forest Plans really bothered me. I found it necessary to prepare a draft memorandum get Deputy Regional Forester Bob Cermak to sign it. The purpose was to remind Forest Supervisors that the National Forest Management Act which called for the Forest Land Management Plans was brought about by the clear-cutting controversies of the late 60s and early 70s and used much of the same wording as the abandoned Executive Order and the subsequent Church Committee Guidelines. The memorandum warned that the contrast of the expected "500,000 to 750,000 acres or more of regeneration cutting (clear-cutting primarily) the first decade in Region 5 . . . with past partial cutting will be substantial" and directed them to be sure to be prepared with "sufficient training, guidance and follow-up to do this job in an acceptable manner." Yet the heavy emphasis upon clear-cutting continued. Getting out the cut was still topmost in their minds. It was continually reinforced by the words and actions of Assistant Sec. of Agriculture John Crowell. He was the former legal counsel for the Louisiana-Pacific Timber Corporation appointed by President Reagan to oversee the Forest Service.

Finally, in early May of 1982, the Washington Office Recreation Staff, in response to requests from Regions, an attempt to increase uniformity of treatment of recreation and visual resources in the allocations of prescriptions for land uses in FORPLAN, set up a national workshop in Ft. Collins, Colorado. It was held at the USFS's Computer Center and involved the Washington Office's detached unit of the Land Management Planning Staff stationed there as well as recreation staff personnel and landscape architects from the Washington Office and all Regional Offices. The session was headed up by Dick Benjamin, Recreation Planning Assistant in the Chief's Office.

Problems were discussed and participants received reinforcement of their limited training in the use of FORPLAN. There were requests from the Regional people for national direction, but it was apparent that there was not going to be any strong direction forthcoming that might jeopardize commodity production. Planner Steve Mealey of the Ft. Collins Land Management Planning Staff pleaded for the Washington Office Recreation Staff to set minimum standards as permitted by the NFMA Regulations. Benjamin, a former District Ranger and Forest Supervisor, was very edgy about developing any direction that might have impact upon timber production. Considerable concern was expressed by participants about the low RPA values being utilized for Recreation Visitor Days of developed, dispersed and wilderness use as compared to higher wildlife/fisher user day values. There was a consensus that the 1980 RPA values were too low and out of synchronization with higher values established for hunting and fishing user days. The participants were provided with information on the new values developed for the Forest Service by Colorado State University researchers Loomis and Sorg which appeared much more reasonable. The ultimate

result, however, was no minimum standards being set by the Recreation Staff of the Washington Office.

Benjamin rode with Gary Plisco and me back down to the Denver's Stapleton Airport. He indicated that he was going to apply for Alan Lamb's job. Gary Plisco said he was not applying. My heart sunk! This was a revolting development in my mind. Alan was retiring the following week. My brief experience with Dick Benjamin and what I had heard of his relationship with Bob Ross was not promising. He appeared to be Hell-bent for commodity production even though presently working in the recreation field.

During his last week on the job, Alan Lamb met with Regional Forester Zane Smith and got the go-ahead on his proposal to upgrade my position to GS-14. He had checked with Ed Stone and gotten a promise of Ed's support on the move. The Pacific Southwest Region had been the first to upgrade the position to GS-13 in 1959. By 1982 all regions but the Alaska Region had GS-13 Regional Landscape Architects. The complexity of the job continued to be greater than that of any other region in our minds—significantly greater than several regions. And, fifteen years earlier when I had accepted the job, the Recreation Division Organizational Plan called for upgrading this position, Recreation Administration, and Recreation Planning to GS-14. The Recreation Administration position had been upgraded about ten years previous. Alan had me revise my job description and asked Gary Plisco, who would be Acting Director, to get the promotion processed.

We were in another cutback mode at the time. Ray Collins had been the agency's first black to be hired as a landscape architect and had been in the Regional Office for 20 years. His productivity in landscape architecture had been low due to the long tenure and his heavy involvement in other programs. I had counseled Ray Collins on early retirement for several months with Alan Lamb's concurrence. Ray had the potential of doing much better in the private sector. He considered the option for considerable time and decided to retire. We abolished his job and had to offer him a field position which he naturally turned down. He retired the last working day of May. I would have liked to refill the position with an upcoming young landscape architect, but that was impossible. I expected the opportunity to re-establish a position would arise in a couple of years. The Regional Office was now down to a single landscape architect, me, whereas there were four of us back in 1967 when I came. There were, however, 57 landscape architects on the eighteen forest units compared to 14 when I had reported for duty.

The tabulation of existing visual condition inventories in the Pacific Southwest Region indicated that there was a much lower degree of altered forest landscapes than had been predicted in the Regional Plan. Comparison with the inventoried VQOs clearly showed that the inventoried objectives would allow for substantial reductions in visual quality. They were not the idealistic "pie-in-the-sky" goals that critics had thought. Inasmuch as it was anticipated that even these compromised VQOs would have to be traded off in many cases so as to reduce their constraints on timber production and other activities, it now became clear that visual quality would be significantly reduced on most, if not all of the national forests in California over the next few decades. Only a major change in Forest Service policy or direction would prevent such a disaster. That was not likely with Crowell calling the shots.

Attempts to quantify visual resources was becoming more important in the planning processes that were developing. Commodity resources such as timber and grazing could come up with definitive measures of board feet of lumber, cords of fuel wood, pounds of red meat, numbers of jobs, and dollars involved. Amenity resources such as scenic beauty and wildlife sightings had little basis for

A Personal Narrative of a U. S. Forest Service Landscape Architect in the 1958-86 Period

measurement, especially in terms of economic benefits. Some research had been done on the costs of visual resource management to timber production; on a values forgone basis.

I continued almost full time on land management planning. The draft forest plans were piling up on our Regional LMP Interdisciplinary Team. There was still work being done on the Lake Tahoe Basin Environmental Thresholds that needed my attention.

To my dismay, Dick Benjamin was selected to replace Alan Lamb. Once he learned of the planned upgrading of my position he began to throw in delays and roadblocks. It was obvious that he was opposed to having a landscape architect at the same level as the Recreation Administration Group Leader. He was successful in killing Alan Lamb's proposal for my promotion. Dick also appeared to have concerns about my representing the Staff on the Regional LMP Interdisciplinary Team. However, he could not find anyone else who was willing to take on the job. His relations with his Cultural Resource Group were equally trying for them, if not worse. Yet in that area he had to be guided by specific laws.

Another Regional Landscape Architect retired in August when Ivan Fish of the Southwest Region decided to call it a career. He was one of the newer breed and had moved into the Regional Landscape Architect job after I had. Soon another generation of landscape architects would be taking over all those positions.

USDA Policy Memorandum 1827 of 1978 was rescinded and replaced with another that had little or no mention of scenic resources. This was a blow as I had depended heavily on it to maintain scenic quality emphasis.

Apparently Gary Plisco had nominated me earlier in the year for an Award of Excellence from the National Society for Park Resources (NSPR). He had earlier showed me the nomination form and asked if we should nominate Ed Stone, but I told him that Ed had gotten a major NSPR award already. I was notified in the fall that the retiring Yellowstone National Park Superintendent and I had been selected and would receive these awards at the National Recreation and Park Association (NRPA) Annual Meeting in Louisville, Kentucky in late October. Travel funds were cut back that year as they often were. Dick Benjamin, as Staff Director, planned to attend that meeting as it was as usual linked together with the annual meeting of Regional Staff Directors. He came to me and said it would not be necessary for me to go to Louisville as he would pick up the award for me. It was necessary for me to inform the NSPR of this. Something then happened behind the scenes as Dick told me a bit later that I was to go to Louisville after all. Somehow, travel funds were found for me to make the trip and accept the award.

1983

In January Howard Orr was named Director of Recreation in the Southern Region. He had formerly been Regional Landscape Architect in the Rocky Mountain and Southern Regions as well as Deputy Forest Supervisor for the National Forests in Georgia. He filled into the Recreation Director's job in back of Jerry Coutant, another landscape architect. Jerry went into another intergovernmental position overseeing the Appalachian Trail Program and once again avoided a Washington Office assignment.

Over the years I had managed to develop quite a library of photographic slides, books and technical materials on landscape architecture and visual resources. My tiny office was stacked high with

bookshelves. Dick Benjamin ordered the Staff to clean up our offices and send many of the files to the Records Center and throw out others not specifically required for retention. My library was a target—he felt it was entirely out of balance with my needs. To me such a ready source of information was absolutely essential to me and the forest landscape architects. I was able to provide documented assistance to inquiries from the field and others in short order. Without such a library I would have had to given “off-the-top” responses. I stubbornly held onto the library but did cull it down a bit and reorganize it.

For several years we had had access to the PSW Forest and Range Experiment Station's WESTFORNET publication loan service which I had used heavily. It was often suggested that our Staff membership be canceled because we did pay annual fees for the service. We managed to hang onto it. I never ceased to be amazed at the scanty libraries of materials of other than the Cultural Resource Group. It seemed to me that too many relied solely on the Forest Service Manuals and laws and did not reach out to gather contemporary data to help them in their work. There seemed to be a certain pride in being able to respond to technical questions without any reference to outside sources.

Our Region's landscape architect seminar was held in the Bay Area that year—in Millbrae. Again there was heavy emphasis on computerized planning. Perspective Plot was the primary program involved. Mary Arneson of the Pacific Northwest Region joined us to explore that subject. At the time there was a national “Lot 7” computergraphic hardware contract being developed for bids. The primary hardware competitors were Tektronix and Hewlett Packard. The Forest Service had hardware and software for both systems and strong advocates of each. Our Region had orders in for 7 systems while the Northwest Region was to get 46! The system was used for logging systems engineering, road design, and visual resource management purposes.

I roughed out some ideas and distributed them to the forest landscape architects in the Pacific Southwest Region in a note on May 5. The basis for converting scenic quality to dollars per acre per year was established from previous work on a Visual Quality Index and assumed values for viewing per hour extracted from other works. This was then multiplied by the estimated total viewing hours of a particular landscape. These values ranged from \$.00 for ravaged sites with low inherent scenic quality to \$5.00 per viewing hour for pristine sites with outstanding inherent scenic quality. Three typical examples developed using this system indicated values of \$18 to \$270 per acre per year for scenic quality values.

That seemed to indicate quite a high value. But how did it compare to timber values? On the low side, a site producing 20 cubic feet of wood per acre per year which was used in NFMA as the break point for capable timber producing land, would perhaps produce 150 board feet per year. At a stumpage price of \$200 per thousand board feet this would mean it was worth \$30 per acre per year. If it was a very good timber growing site that produced 35,000 board feet per acre in a 100 year rotation, this would mean 350 board feet per acre per year or \$70 per acre per year. The higher scenic quality lands with many annual viewers would be worth more than the timber values in either case! And, of course there were other values to be considered as well, and other costs, such as the road construction and timber sale preparation. It seemed worth more investigation.

The concept of valuing scenic quality was expressed “in a nutshell”, utilizing economic terms as follows:

Scenery is a product.

A Personal Narrative of a U. S. Forest Service Landscape Architect in the 1958-86 Period

It can be seen.

It can be described.

It can be mapped.

It can be modified.

It can be experienced, with varying psychological effects.

It varies in **quality**.

Its quality varies by the landscape's inherent characteristics

Its quality varies by man's degree of alteration of its inherent characteristics.

It varies in **value**.

Its value varies with its quality.

Its value varies with its **supply**.

Its value varies with its accessibility to viewing.

Its value results from the amount of **demand** to experience its psychological effects.

Its value determines its **importance**.

Its **importance** determines whether it will be maintained, enhanced or traded off to maintain other non-compatible values.

But it was almost futile to gain acceptance of placing dollar values on scenery. Some did not think it possible. Some didn't believe that the values would be high enough if they were developed. Others worried that the values might be high and the effects too powerful for the comfort of timber management.

In mid-May Barbara and I spent a week in Kauia for our 25th anniversary. It was our first trip there and was a nice relaxing break.

At this time Forest landscape architect Jeff Nonemaker had gotten an offer to help establish an overseas college campus for La Verne University in Athens, Greece. He had 15 years with the Forest Service so it was a tough decision. I advised him to take it as it was a once in a lifetime opportunity. He had earned a Master's in Public Administration while on the job in Southern California and was working on a doctorate at La Verne University the time. There was no indication that the Forest Service would take this into account so his future in the agency was not especially bright. He accepted the offer and later wound up as co-owner of the overseas campus when La Verne university pulled out.

At this time the herbicide issue was still a major one. The Pacific Southwest Region had renewed their efforts to develop a Region-wide Environmental Impact Statement on Vegetation Management for Reforestation. That title had apparently been chosen to soften and broaden its impact. I had been providing visual resource data since November of 1982 to an interdisciplinary team. The requests came with short turnaround time and I had spent one solid weekend developing a customized method of describing the varying visual impacts of numerous combinations of regeneration techniques developed by that team. I prepared and sent our staff comments on their rough draft in mid-February. In late June 1983 a copy of the DEIS being distributed to the public was received in our staff and I was shocked to see that my input had been changed. Upon checking I found that the Timber staff personnel responsible for the DEIS explained that they felt my analysis did not have adequate research support and might be misinterpreted. Therefore they had taken the liberty of revising it and including some research data which seemed to be more supportive of the use of herbicide use alternatives. In analyzing the revised data in the DEIS, I was unable to come up with conclusions anywhere close to the visual resource effects stated in the DEIS. This was extremely troubling.

I typed a one page personal note to my boss, Dick Benjamin expressing my disappointment in the way the situation was handled and suggested that the note be passed along to Regional Forester Zane Smith. After explaining what had happened, I went on to say, "My concern is one of principles and professional ethics. If alteration of the work of a seasoned professional specialist is directed or condoned, I would be very disappointed in the Forest Service. I really hope this is not true. . . . I feel that allowing such important documents on such a critical issue to go out to the public with doubtful supportability of facts presented provides an unfortunate potential for loss of public trust in our ability to be stewards of their National Forests." No response was made to my note.

The Mono Lake Basin National Scenic Area (NSA) on Inyo National Forest was established by Congress despite Forest Service opposition. Within the Pacific Southwest Regional Office, there was considerable grumbling about the NSA designation and its requirements. The feeling remained that special designations and directions for special studies and plans from Congress were infringing on the Forest Service's management priorities. Since Associate Chief Robertson had testified against special appropriations requirements and Congress had accommodated that request, it looked as if the Forest Service now had to dig up the funds for the planning, development and special studies out of their regular budget which was already so lean that some recreation sites had to be closed down. Now, it seemed that a NSA was too important to have landscape architects involved with—even if it was a National Scenic Area. Others handled the project from the Regional Office and I learned most of what I knew about it from the newspapers and Forest Service newsletters.

Negative FS happenings were piling up. To Chief Landscape Architect Ed Stone, I griped in a personal note, "As I see it there are now far too many people without any spine in the Forest Service, and they are allowing all sorts of rotten things to go on without saying a word." I told Ed that I realized that I was getting to be a complainer, but here were some reasons for it, "Maybe my problem is that I've had the opportunity to dig fairly deeply into Forest planning and find that numbers are being manufactured to fit the predetermined Preferred Alternative. Maybe it is sickening to see how unprofessional the professionals can be when put under pressure. Maybe it is disheartening to see us try to slip things by the public in those plans and think they'll be too stupid to pick up inconsistencies. Maybe it is losing faith in an outfit I once respected."

That note enclosed a copy of another note to Chief Landscape Architect Bob Ross in which I questioned the reasons for Forest Service Chief Max Peterson being named an Honorary Member of the American Society of Landscape Architects. In my mind "he has presided over the world's greatest de-emphasis of a successful landscape management program. He may not be the one behind the move but I see little fight to save it." Not too coincidentally, Russell Dickenson, Director of the National Park Service and one who seemed to get along quite well with Interior Secretary Watt, was also made a Honorary Member. It looked to some of us as if the politics of National Park Service-Forest Service competition was bringing about such honors which may not have been deserved.

Regional Landscape Tom Hagan of the Intermountain Region, having been sent a copy of my note to Ross, responded with "Honorary Members of ASLA were according to their handbook, to be 'persons other than landscape architects who have performed notable service for the profession of landscape architecture.' What notable services were performed?" He went on to say, "Hope it wasn't a well-intentioned effort to win favor. The honorees could interpret it as an endorsement of

past actions and policies and/or a mandate to continue them. Where does that leave us?" Ed Stone was very upset and concerned about my notes and a flurry of notes changed hands. Both Ross and Stone later responded to the Regional Landscape Architects with notes to the effect that Chief Peterson was actually supportive of the landscape architecture profession; that he and Dickenson had been nominated by a National Park Service employee who was in the higher circles of the ASLA; and that we should be sharing more of the positive achievements rather than problems with each other.

With some luck a mandatory requirement was instituted in the Pacific Southwest Region to protect all existing and proposed corridors of the State Scenic Highway System in California. These corridors had been established by the state legislature in the early 1970s. I had been pushing for something like this, but had met formidable resistance. Then all of the sudden, the LMP Staff incorporated it in their directions.

After a long gestation period, the Servicewide contract for graphics computers was awarded. Up until then there were some smaller desktop units being used for landscape perspectives and logging system analyses. The contract went to Hewlett-Packard for the new 9000 series. Our region had only managed to set aside funding for a half dozen units whereas the Pacific Northwest Region had dozens ordered. This was another major breakthrough for computer perspective work and testing the EFFALT system, clear-cutting, and ski area development proposals. No HP 9000 system was set up for the Regional Office in San Francisco, however, but one was set up at the Pleasant Hill Engineering Center across the Bay.

1984.

In February Regional Landscape Architects Ron Walters, George Lundy and I met as a task force set up by Bob Ross. We got together for several days in Milwaukee regarding the updating of the Visual Management System handbook. We came to agreement on some bold revisions and prepared a report for distribution to all Forest Service landscape architects to get their reactions. Although many had complained about the existing system, it seemed that there was also reluctance to make changes. Too many had gotten used to the system and were not about to have to learn new additions or revisions.

In the spring I responded to a call for papers on land management planning by the International Union of Forest Research Organizations for their Annual Meeting in October at the University of Tokyo. The request was circulated by the Chief's Office LMP Staff. I prepared a proposal on a paper on needed quantification methods in scenic resource management research. Shortly afterwards I received word from Tokyo that my paper would be accepted and I should plan to participate. Apparently several papers by Forest Service employees had been accepted. This probably was a surprise and the Chief's Office LMP Staff had to cull the number down. They asked for Regional evaluation of the papers to assist them in selecting who would go as official attendees at Forest Service expense. I learned that of three papers in our region, mine had been selected. Being on the West Coast, I expected to have a better chance of being selected to attend. However, it was weeks before we could get any information on the Chief's Office selection. Finally I checked on it again and learned that two participants had been selected and one was from our region but it was not me. They had not even bothered to notify the rest of us! This was a bit upsetting to me. I fired a note off to the Director of LMP in the Chief's Office (who I knew quite well) letting him know that I felt that their handling of the situation was extremely poor. I had no response.

I decided that if the Forest Service wouldn't send me, I would go on my own. And since Barbara and I had always wanted to visit the gardens and sights of Japan, we would both go. The IUFRO did have a provision to subsidize expenses of non-agency sponsored participants. They covered the registration and hotel costs for the meeting days. Dick Benjamin did go to bat for me on the trip and after much hassle I was allowed administrative leave for the days of the symposium. Barbara and I found bargain fares to Tokyo and the symposium was extremely interesting due to the diversity of attendees from all over the globe. Once in Tokyo though, I learned that 3-4 more Forest Service personnel had gotten their way paid to the symposium by their regions. I took a week of annual leave after the session and we toured the sights of Tokyo, Kamakura, and Kyoto by subway, Bullet train and bus. This was an outstanding trip for us.

In between times I worked on a professional paper for the refereed Landscape Journal on the subject of visual magnitude. This was a quantification method I had gradually developed over the years beginning with the Mineral King visual analyses by computer and more recently with development of a computerized program by Devon Nickerson. It dealt with the distance, angle of view, and size of visual impacts. By computer analyses it provided a hard number relating to the amount of visual field taken up by that impact. It was accepted and published the following spring. Getting this paper out into the profession so that they could consider the concept's possible future visual assessment applications seemed important to me.

Elsewhere, in March of 1984, the first landscape architect in the Forest Service to fill a Forest Supervisor job was named. It was Ed Brannon who had come rapidly up the ranks in a little over ten years. He had served as a deputy Forest Supervisor as well. This was another major step forward for the profession. Gerry Coutant was no longer able to avoid being assigned to the Chief's Office. He was moved in as head of Interpretive Services.

Regional Forester Zane Smith asked the Forest Supervisors to take the initiative to surface special classifications such as National Recreation Areas and National Scenic Areas in their forest plans. He specifically mentioned areas such as Mt. Shasta, Lake Tahoe and the Big Sur area. He was worried that if these areas were not given adequate consideration for special classifications, they "may become another casualty such as the North Cascades or the Olympic National Park." He went on to say that such classifications might not be carried forward after determining how they might fit into the overall management plans, but they did need to be considered. This was a complete surprise and some of us wondered what was back of it. The Forest Service had in the past steered clear of special designations such as this.

But there was continuing stubbornness on the part of many foresters to let go of the clear-cutting offensive despite the buzz saws of public opinion it had encountered. In a controversy on the Stanislaus NF in California over proposed timber sales, the Sierra Club, Audubon Society and a local group of citizens attacked the clear-cutting in letters to the local papers. About scenic resources they had said, "Large clear-cuts look like the aftermath of some great disaster or explosion; we note that such forest practices may discourage forest visitors from returning thus harming tourism, our county's No. 1 industry." Forest Supervisor Blaine Cornell, in a response asserted, "Clear-cutting can increase yields by as much as six times. It allows introduction of genetically superior trees, improved resistance to insects and disease, and reduces the number of logging entries. Selective cutting is not the panacea it is claimed to be."

Late that summer I began to turn over the work on the Regional LMP IDT to Sonia Tamez of the

Cultural Resource Group. She was interested in that type of work and my other work in the landscape architectural and visual resource fields had been suffering due to the demands of that assignment. Sonia, an archaeologist, had good rapport with scenery management and I was confident that she would battle for our needs. To speed up the transition I volunteered to prepare a job description. She successfully competed for and got the new job of Regional Recreation Planner. The LMP duties were built into that job.

Meanwhile back in Washington, D.C. Bob Ross was promoted to GS-14 and given the title of Chief Landscape Architect. Some of us had been pushing for it. Ed Stone was shedding his close ties to landscape architecture and was swamped with other work as Assistant Director of Recreation.

In September the Western Timber Association complained to Regional Forester Zane Smith in California about a possible 40 million board feet per year reduction in timber harvest on the Plumas NF due to State Scenic Highway viewshed protection standards in the Region's forest planning direction. In reality, it was explained to WTA that indications were that the viewshed protection requirement would result in timber harvest reductions of from 0-4% in the first decade and from 0-2% averaged over the first five decades. The letter I drafted for Smith went on to say, this visual resource management implementation requirement "was developed with the knowledge that it could reduce timber harvest levels on some Forests, but that such losses would be preferable to losses in the visual integrity of these major tourist routes."

In a Pacific Southwest Region Landscape Architects' Workshop in Sacramento that fall, a good amount of time had been spent on discussing proposed "emphasis areas" of Regional and Chief's Office landscape architects. Field landscape architects had heavy interest in emphasizing additional work on the technology of computer perspective programs on desktop computers. This was one area in which the agency was already shining in these otherwise somewhat gloomy times. But a large group of related items dealt with their concerns about the place of landscape architects in the organization; lack of management opportunities, need for developing other skills, the loss of positions and grade levels, the lack of clout of the landscape architects in the agency, the reorganizations taking place that de-emphasized their work, being labeled as "specialists" with second class citizenship compared to those "who got out the cut", the lack of Visual Resource Management advocacy by the FS managers, the lack of rungs in the career ladder, etc.. They also had much interest in improving and simplifying the Visual Management System and in getting more training. There was an underlying current of concern for the future of the profession in the agency.

We began at this time to switch over to computerized communications using Data General terminals. We had to share the terminals and it helped to be on Flextime in order to gain access to one when I needed it. The process of getting memoranda typed became much more rapid as we were charged with preparing our own. In addition, we could communicate directly with electronic mail with the Chief's Office, other Regions and forests. I followed the lead of some other regions with a landscape architect network for the Pacific Southwest Region. With tongue in cheek I named our network LACONIC—the LA for landscape architect, CON for conversation, and added IC for just the fun of it.

Once again there was concern by some of the Forest Service leadership that the landscape architects were communicating amongst themselves without any oversight on what was being said. A few problems did arise when the electronic mail system was used to complain about the agency or

A Personal Narrative of a U. S. Forest Service Landscape Architect in the 1958-86 Period

working situations. Paranoia that landscape architects were plotting against the Forest Service was present in the minds of a few of their insecure supervisors. It always seemed to me that increased communications among us was very productive in spreading of technology and in maintaining morale. The problems it caused were insignificant in comparison to the advantages.

1985.

A tally of the average amount of time devoted to various phases of the job by Pacific Southwest Region landscape architects indicated some dramatic changes since 1960:

<u>Type of Work Performed</u>	<u>Percent of Time</u>			
	<u>1960</u>	<u>1970</u>	<u>1980</u>	<u>1984</u>
Recreation Site Design and Construction	80	67	20	10
Administrative Site Design and Construction	5	5	2	2
Sign Design/ Graphic Presentation	4	3	1	1
Recreation Administration	8	15	10	20
Training others and being Trained	2	4	5	3
Timber VRM	0	1	15	20
Roads VRM	1	1	2	1
Utility Lines VRM	0	1	1	1
Fuel Breaks VRM	0	1	2	1
Wildlife Habitat Management VRM	0	1	1	1
Mining, Geothermal & Oil Leasing VRM	0	0	2	2
Visual Resource Inventories	0	0	15	1
Land Management Planning	0	1	25	37
	100	100	100	100

NOTE: VRM refers to Visual Resource Management activities designed to reduce visual impacts of the land alterations caused by such projects.

By 1985 less than 15% of the landscape architects' work was reflected in the outdated Civil Service Commission standards for the positions. Recreation site design and construction had become a minor part of the job while visual resource management and land management planning had become their major work. Landscape architects were being given more of a role in recreation administration as they seemed to be more people-oriented and had shown talent in that field. Some had difficulty making the changes and never were too successful at converting from intensive design of small recreation sites to the design of whole mountainsides. Others thrived upon the broad design work and their training in planning and design processes made them valuable in the land management planning process. They enjoyed the broad variety of work and the responsibilities loaded upon them, but still were not happy with their "place" in the Forest Service as "specialists" who were among the first to be cut back when funding and personnel ceilings required Reductions in Force.

During the spring, disturbing word got out that a lower echelon Forest Service forester in California had written a paper for a class in which it was alleged that the reforestation acreage figures reports were commonly falsified in order to make them look good. This created quite a stir and Regional Forester Zane Smith made it clear that he would not condone any such activities. He wanted any such malpractice to be personally reported to him. Knowing that it was unlikely that

my note to my boss on the herbicide DEIS alteration had ever reached Smith, I made a copy of my June 29, 1983 note and sent it to him with a cover note indicating that similar alterations of professional data may have taken place in the past.

As a result, the Director of Timber Management, wrote a note to Regional Forester Smith saying his assistants (a forester and a plant pathologist) had determined that my assessment of visual quality effects was inadequate and could not be defended as state-of-the-art so they had decided back in 1983 that this section "had to be drastically upgraded." They revised it on their own as I was allegedly out of the office for an extended period of time. My calendar, however, showed that I had never been out of the office more than four days in a row during the period in question. I was also flabbergasted to learn that a forester and a plant pathologist would be making judgments on the quality of a visual resource assessment by a professional landscape architect who had been a major contributor to the development of the Forest Service Visual Management System and had authored numerous published professional papers on the subject of visual resource assessments. Even though Regional Forester Smith wrote a note saying I was "right on" and that he shared my concern, this seemed to be a turning point. My disappointment in the agency increased and I began to consider an early retirement option.

It now seemed obvious that the Staff directors and others were shielding too much information from the Regional Forester in the hopes that he didn't want to know about more problems or be the recipient of bad news. But how could top management be in touch unless they did learn of such things as alterations of data and the use of fictitious numbers on reports?

Reorganizations were in vogue in the Forest Service during these days of lean funding. In California, the two forests with the heaviest landscape architectural work loads, Angeles and Shasta-Trinity NFs, were proposing to slash the number of positions and place this specialist discipline lower down in the organizational chart. In both cases this was barely averted after arguments were presented to the Forest Supervisors and Regional Forester not to allow expediency in meeting funding constraints to dictate grade levels and numbers of professional landscape architects while simultaneously expecting the same amount of work to be produced by them at the same level of complexity as before. Regional Forester Smith indicated he agreed that the agency somehow had to "bridge" these tough times and maintain the best employees.

On the homefront, our daughter Ann left her astro-physics major at UC-Berkeley married and soon became very successful in the insurance claims field. Son David graduated summa cum laude from San Francisco State University in international relations and applied and received a full tuition scholarship to Georgetown University's Russian Area Studies program. The youngest, daughter Caroline, was enrolled in Palmer Chiropractic College in Bay Area campus. Things had worked out well with them and we were delighted with them. The house was emptying and our lives were changing. Barbara continued working as an Administrative Assistant with a real estate investment firm.

In June we held another VMS Task Force Meeting in the Chief's Office as a follow-up of the Milwaukee VMS Task Force the previous year. Bob Ross headed up the meeting and Regional Landscape Architect Ron Walters of the Pacific Northwest Region, Forest Landscape Architect Al Grapel of that same Region and I struggled with the problem of revising and expanding the 11 year old system. The Visual Management System had been tremendously successful, but the supply of handbooks had run out long ago and the galley proofs of the original had disappeared. It appeared to be a good time to revise the system to include other subsystems such as Visual Absorption

Capability and Existing Visual Condition as well as fix some problems in the system. We came up with a recommended solution and suggested that the revisions be carried out by someone such as Prof. Wayne Tlusty of the University of Wisconsin who had Forest Service experience as well as ready access to graduate students. We doubted that Ed Stone would go along with the proposal, but upon presentation of it to him the final day, he fully committed himself to it. Somehow, we needed to find a source of funding to carry out the revisions and printing of a new handbook. That would not be easy in these days of cutbacks in amenity programs and timber program emphasis.

I foresaw the value of compiling a map of all the Variety Class A lands on national forests in the region to be used in various ways. Among them was the thought that they could be used by the public to improve their vacation planning. Scenery was a major item to most of them. This key information seemed too valuable to keep filed away in Forest Service offices. I worked with the cartography section on the preparation of a map but delays due to their schedule held it up. I expect it died on the vine when I retired.

However, we did finally wrap up the "Regional privy standards" study and sent out sets of the approved plans to all forests. It was a good feeling to complete that controversial project. To have continued developing new designs for almost every project was far too inefficient to continue.

A General Management Review of the Pacific Southwest Region Action Plan by personnel from the Chief's Office listed an interesting "Area of Concern": "Several areas of unique regional and national significance are within the National Forests in the State. Included are areas such as Mt. Shasta, Big Sur Coast, San Gabriel Canyon, and Big Bear Lake. These areas are unique for their physical and biological features, and for their proximity to millions of urban dwellers. Recently the newly appointed Director of the National Park Service referred to Big Sur and Lake Tahoe as examples of areas deserving more protection and management attention. The Forest Service has an opportunity, through selective placement of creative and innovative managers, to foster public perception of the positive aspects of National Forest management in these unique areas."

Action Items included developing "a system for appropriate national recognition" of such areas, emphasizing such areas in final Forest Land Management Plans and encouraging "consideration of special designations and cooperative ventures with other jurisdictions", creating a selection criteria for selection of managers of such areas, and developing "an active program of public information and education to emphasize the positive aspects of National Forest management in areas of regional and national significance."

This seemed to be a reinforcement of Regional Forester Smith's earlier direction to his Forest Supervisors and was a welcome change. Normally the Forest Service was against special classification of NF lands as it usually carried restrictions on the uses allowed or required the expenditure of additional funds. The real deep concern, however, was more likely that if something like this was not done, the new National Park Service Director, William Penn Mott, Jr., would find a way to convince Ronald Reagan to turn such areas over to the NPS. He was making moves to expand the NPS system. Mott had been previously appointed Director of State Parks & Recreation when Reagan was governor of California and the two contemporaries in their mid-70s seemed to get along well.

During these important times of public review of draft forest plans, I made efforts to get the American Society of Landscape Architects' three chapters in California and the four schools of landscape architecture in the State University system involved in plan reviews and comments.

Since 20 million acres of the California landscape were subject to major land alteration decisions, it seemed that these groups should be interested. Apparently the effort failed as no comments were noted from them in future months. Granted, the proper review of such voluminous documents took several hours, but wasn't it important enough? The lack of their involvement was disappointing. I also attempted to get San Francisco Chronicle environmental columnist Harold Gilliam interested in bringing the Forest Planning issue before the public. He responded with a note to me agreeing that it was important but never wrote such a column.

Somewhat related to this, at the ASLA Annual Meeting in Cincinnati on October 11, Prof. Ervin H. Zube of the University of Arizona presented a paper, "Landscape Planning at the Crossroads". He was concerned about a backwash in "the federal leadership role in promulgating new and implementing existing policies that address landscape issues and problems that are widespread geographically an/or transcend political boundaries."

I had been asked by Prof. Fabos of the Univ. of Massachusetts to prepare a paper for the Regional Planning session at that meeting. I did so—it covered the use of EFFALT in FORPLAN in land management planning. It was a very difficult subject and I don't expect that many understood what I had to say.

By mid-October I had made the decision to take the early retirement option at the end of the year. However, I waited until after Thanksgiving to prepare my official application. To continue to take part in the dismantling of the carefully developed programs seemed repulsive; it seemed similar to be ordered to the piece by piece destruction of a house that had been exactly crafted and was functioning well. The de-emphasis on visual resource management; the gradual "streamlining" of controls, quality standards, and FS manual direction; and the continual destruction (by means of reorganizations) of the landscape architect grade structure that had been so patiently developed over the previous eighteen years; the tendency of many to forget professional ethics and take short cuts of expediency, and the outlook for the next couple of years of Reaganized government were too painful to endure any longer. It appeared that it might be possible to do more good from outside the agency than trying to make changes within. Whistle-blowing opportunities were coming along much too often and doing so was not a pleasant task.

That fall a strong movement was afoot in Northwest California to create a National Park or other special management for the Smith River Canyon. From what I gleaned on the subject, the Forest Service seemed to be very worried about losing control of that great timber-producing country. Maybe D'Arcy Bonnet's battles and mine over the highway reconstruction proposals had been worth the effort after all. It later became a National Recreation Area, established by congress.

In early December, when I was on a short detail to the Chief's Office, Ed Stone surprised many by announcing that he was also taking early retirement at year's end. His job as Assistant Director of Recreation had taken him almost completely out of the field of landscape architecture although Chief Landscape Architect Bob Ross reported to him. No doubt he missed the days of the 1970 period when he was given such free reign on building up the visual resource management program. He had been very successful and the program gained international attention. Now, he too, was having to watch its de-emphasis and dismantling at a time when it was just beginning to become effective.

My detail to the Chief's Office was for the purpose of attempting to develop a value or weighting system for each of the recreation opportunity spectrum classes. I worked with the staff's economist

Dr. Gary Elsner and recreation planner Mark Petty on concepts.

A reorganization proposal of our Recreation Staff came out in early December. Upon analyses, it appeared that it would lead to further de-emphasis of the landscape architect function. Back in 1948, Landscape Architecture was one of the two Recreation Branches in the Recreation & Lands Division in the Regional Office for California. In the 1960 it was one of three Branches in the newly separated Recreation Division and had four landscape architects. By 1984 it was one of seven Groups in the Recreation Staff with one landscape architect, and by 1986 it appeared that it would be one of eight Groups in a renamed Recreation, Wilderness and Cultural Resources Staff with one landscape architect. Naturally, I protested the proposed reorganization in writing, but never got a response.

I continued to be convinced that the Regional Forester was being kept in the dark on too many issues and felt that it would be worth a try to inform him of my numerous concerns about the visual resource management program and the landscape architecture profession in the FS before I left the organization. It was worth one more try. I prepared and sent a seven page "white paper" titled, "Concerns About the Effect of Reorganizations Upon Landscape Architect Careers — And the Ultimate Effects Upon the National Forest Landscapes" to the Regional Forester, Director of Recreation, Research Landscape Architect Schwarz in Berkeley, Chief Landscape Architect Ross, and all forest landscape architects in the Pacific Southwest Region.

It listed current problems concerning reorganization plans. Briefly they were:

1. They tend to de-emphasize recreation and landscape architecture staffing.
2. They tend to ignore that recreation and scenic resources will be the dominating values in the future on National Forests.
3. They tend to remove needed rungs from the landscape architect career ladder.
4. They tend to ignore job classification standards and expect people to perform at levels above their grade.
5. They tend to ignore the cumulative effects of all such reorganizations.
6. They make it difficult to recruit, thus difficult to increase the number of women landscape architects.
7. They tend to drop landscape architect grade levels much more often than other professional levels.
8. They tend to reduce such grade levels on forests which is not consistent with increasing delegation of authority to the forests.
9. They tend to discriminate against true creative skills in favor of those with supervisory skills.
10. They tend to regress back into organizational patterns of the past rather than looking ahead to future trends.

A Personal Narrative of a U. S. Forest Service Landscape Architect in the 1958-86 Period

11. They tend to cause the best professional personnel to leave the organization as they perceive a lack of future career opportunities.
12. The lack of seasoned professional designers will cost more in the long run due to improper designs.
13. The hanging threat of such reorganizations reduces morale and efficiency at a time when we can't afford any inefficiency.

In addition to reorganization concerns there were other concerns about de-emphasis of landscape architectural roles:

1. The landscape architect Civil Service Standards have not been revised in over 20 years despite being badly obsolete.
2. The grade level of the Regional Landscape Architect 25 years ago was the same as that of Forest Supervisors, but now is one or two levels lower.
3. The "streamlining" of the environmental analyses process has caused some of them to be completely lacking in visual analysis.
4. The Region's recommendation on the General Management Review indicated a desire to de-emphasize visual resource management research in order to add needed recreation research. There are other research programs that seem to exist by tradition more than current need which could be sacrificed.
5. There is a lack of knowledge of the history of the agency's cyclical problems in its image which have helped cause it to lose its crown jewel landscapes to the National Park Service.

Recommendations were made to alleviate such concerns:

1. Develop Regional Office capabilities to assess cumulative effects of reorganizations.
2. Make some effort to look at future trends while developing reorganization plans.
3. Reverse the trend of delegation of more authority when reducing grade and expertise level on forests.
4. Develop a specialist career ladder to recognize outstanding creativity and technical knowledge.
5. Give more consideration to retaining the key individuals rather than traditional positions in periods of cutback.
6. Develop a better sense of an objective history of the FS in all employees.
7. Make a major public statement that the USFS is going to maintain higher standards of public land stewardship.

8. Diligently pursue the updating of landscape architect job standards with the Office of Personnel Management.
9. Take action to upgrade the Regional Landscape Architect position to GS-14 as planned in 1967 and as aborted in 1983.
10. Make a concerted effort to continuously maintain superlative landscapes on NF lands rather than reacting against NPS takeover proposals.
11. Give strong consideration to developing a Regional design team so as to maintain personnel with expertise during cutback periods.

Regional Forester Smith responded by note that he didn't think the concerns were unique to landscape architects, but he was concerned about the effects upon visual resources. He indicated he liked the recommendations and asked if I'd be willing to present them to the Chief and USDA. Since I would be retiring on January 3 and the Christmas holiday period would not be a good time to set it up, I recommended that Chief Landscape Architect Bob Ross do so if it could be arranged. Smith passed along my note to Recreation Staff Director Roy Feuchter in the Chief's Office.

A copy of that seven page paper and the 1982 USDA Policy Memorandum which had deleted the references to maintaining visual resources were sent to ASLA's new president, John Wacker on December 23, with the hope that he might join with Ross in a such presentation of concerns and recommendations. There was no indication that any such opportunity for a presentation to the Chief was ever made available.

If it appears that I was retiring with bitterness toward the agency, this could well be true although I did not think so. There was definitely disappointment about the way the Forest Service seemed to be straying away from its mission to steward the land for the public benefit. I always felt that the "National Forest Idea" was an outstanding one and continued to hope that the agency could get back on track and deserve to be recognized as a world leader in public land management. The talent was there—it just needed to be allowed to be applied rather than stifled. I had a strong feeling that things would turn around in a decade or so and was determined to do what I could as a retiree to make it happen.

There had been a lot of change brought about in the 18 1/2 years. We had 17 landscape architects in the Region in 1967 when I began. Now there were 49. We had one GS-13 and one GS-12 landscape architect then. Now we had five GS-13s and nine GS-12s. Whereas there were no landscape architects serving as District Rangers or Forest Staff Officers then, there were now seven. Having a role in hiring nearly one hundred landscape architects in the last twenty years was rewarding. Seeing some of the outstanding ones such as Al Grapel, Gary Brogan, Gary Vogt, Steve Galliano leave the Region was difficult, but having them come back again was great. Al and Steve went on a second time.

We had entered the computer age and developed a series of sophisticated scenic resource inventories and taken a strong role in Forest Land & Resource Management Plans. Many other things had improved. Meanwhile it was time for someone with new ideas and lots of youthful energy to take over. There was plenty room for great strides to be made in the future.

A Personal Narrative of a U. S. Forest Service Landscape Architect in the 1958-86 Period

The last major project I completed was the R-5 Recreation Site Planning Handbook. We had worked on it in the last several years with several starts being interrupted. Earlier I had assigned Ray Collins to work on it with Gary Brogan's assistance as a detailer to the Regional Office, but it was not yet in condition to print. I did not wish to leave it incomplete with the hope that my successor would eventually get to it. I knew that whoever it was that took my place would be swamped for many, many months in learning the job and trying to survive.

On Friday, January 3, 1986 I put in my last day on the job. I turned in my gold Forest Service driver's license (no accidents in the last 25 years), my Forest Service badge, my building pass, and my keys. Many retiree candidates managed to "lose" their Forest Service badges as they make good souvenirs.

I had driven into work that day as I had a couple of boxes of material from my cleaned out desk. As I drove down the Bayshore Freeway towards home, I felt great having entered a new level of freedom. It reminded me of what Dick Wilson had said about his concerns about retirement. Dick was dyed-in-the-wool Forest Service. He was unsure if he could handle being separated from his long ties with the Forest Service and expected a long period of withdrawal symptoms. But to his surprise, he found that within a week after he retired, he no longer missed the job.

Epilogue.

Barbara and I spent the following week in Arizona selecting a retirement location. We looked first at Prescott, then Sedona, and finally Payson. There was no question but that Sedona's red rocks was the best place—almost like living in the midst of a national park. I had first visited the Sedona area while on my single field trip with the National Park Service in the late fall of 1957. My NPS boss decided to give me a treat on a Sunday afternoon as we were driving from Montezuma Well NM to Tuzigoot NM. He had a spot picked out on a red rock formation on which to build a summer home there. Fortunately, it still remains as open National Forest land. Barbara and I had returned to Sedona in 1961 with baby, David. Then we had driven down Oak Creek Canyon and through Sedona again with all the children several years later.

Barbara continued to work while I prepared the house for sale and enjoyed my freedom. In June I went back to the office to spend a day with my replacement, Gary Brogan of Angeles NF, who belatedly had been selected as my replacement.

That fall the American Society of Landscape Architects held their Annual Meeting in San Francisco. I was one of those honored to be nominated and elected as a Fellow that year.

1987

It took us over a year to sell our house on Gramercy Drive in San Mateo. On Memorial Day weekend of 1987 we moved to a home in Sedona on a hilltop lot with spectacular 360 degree views of the red rock formations and a common boundary with the Munds Mountain Wilderness of Coconino National Forest.

APPENDIX A

U. S. Forest Service Site Plans Prepared by Wayne Iverson. 1958-1965

NOTE: The year shown is the field season. The actual completion of many of the plans was during the following winter months of December through March. Thus the "years" ran from April through March. An asterisk (*) after the site name indicates that I only drafted the "As Built" plan that had been designed previously or made additions to others' plans. Those with a double asterisk(**) indicate sites where some revisions and barrier layout plans were added to the older site plans done by others. The list is not complete, especially for Stanislaus and Modoc NF.

1958

Inyo National Forest

June Lake Beach
Minaret Summit Vista
Pine Alpha Picnic Ground & Administrative Site
Patriarch Picnic Area
Horseshoe Lake Group Camps, Swimming and Picnic Area
Big Pine Creek Recreation Area
Big Pine Creek Campground
Reds Meadow Campground**

Stanislaus National Forest

Bloomfield Campground
Upper Baker Campground**
Clark Fork Campground*
Clark Fork Extension Campground

1959

Inyo National Forest

Crystal Crag Lodge
West Twin Lakes Campground*
Lower Rock Creek Campground*
Convict Lake Campground*
Pine Glade Recreation Residence Lieu Lot Tract
Tufa Campground
Lone Pine Campground
Tamarack Lodge Resort
Glass Creek Campground
Lee Vining Creek Campground
Pine Grove Campground
Oak Creek Campground
Lower Oak Creek Campground

Stanislaus National Forest

Pinecrest Campground
Cherry Valley Campground Extension Campground
Cherry Valley Commercial Site (Boat Launch/Store)
Cherry Valley Pack Station
Indian Cliffs Campground**

A Personal Narrative of a U. S. Forest Service Landscape Architect in the 1958-86 Period

APPENDIX A

1960

Inyo National Forest

Boulder Lodge Resort
Rock Creek Lodge Resort
Convict Lake Resort
Big Rock Landing
Pine Cliff Trailer Park
Grays Meadow Campground
Lower Grays Meadow Campground
Onion Valley Campground
Tioga Lake Picnic Ground
Ellery lake Campground/Picnic Ground
East Twin Lakes Campground*
Shady Rest Campground*

Stanislaus National Forest

Beardsley Overlook
Crescent Cove Roadside Rest
Pinecrest Amphitheater
Cherry Valley Waterfront (Swimming & picnicking)

1961

Inyo National Forest

Silver Lake Trailer Court
Tioga Pass Resort
Rock Creek Lake Day Use Site
Rock Creek Lake Group Camp
Whitney Portal Day Use Site
Juniper Point Picnic Ground
Hot Creek Day Use Site
Lake Mary Day Use Site
Mamie Cove Day Use Site
Silver Lake Campground**

Stanislaus National Forest

Pinecrest Stables
Dardanelle Campground**
Meadowview Campground**
Big Meadow Campground**
Donnels Vista
Fraser Flat Campground

1962

Inyo National Forest

Reds Meadow Resort & Pack Station
Mammoth Pack Station
June Mountain Ski Area Base Area
Toll House Picnic Ground/ Historic Site

APPENDIX A

Lee Vining Ranger Station
Lone Pine Ranger Station
Bishop Administrative Site
Convict Lake Caretakers Residence Site
Sierra View Vista
Archeocyathid Fossil Day Use Site
Rock Creek Lake Campground
Mosquito Flat Parking & Picnic Ground
South Lake Parking Area/Picnic Ground
North Fork Big Pine Creek Parking & Picnic Ground
East Shady Rest Campground
Lake Mary Picnic Ground.

Stanislaus National Forest

Pinecrest Beach
Brown's Meadow, Bell Meadow, and Pine Valley Reservoir Recreation Study

1963

Inyo National Forest

Rock Creek Lodge
Onion Valley Pack Station
Silver Lake Resort
Earthquake Fault V. I. S. Site
Junction Picnic Ground
Hot Creek Geysers Swimming Area
Grandview Campground

Stanislaus National Forest

Rainbow Pool Swimming Area
East Lake Alpine Campground

1964

Inyo National Forest

Four Jeffrey Campground
Hartley Spring Campground
Lake Sabrina Picnic Ground
Lake Sabrina Boating Site
East Fork Campground
North Fork Bishop Creek Parking & Picnic Site
Coldwater Campground & Parking Area

Modoc National Forest

Mill Creek Falls Campground
Soup Springs Campground
Plum Valley Campground

1965

Inyo National Forest

June Lake Marina

A Personal Narrative of a U. S. Forest Service Landscape Architect in the 1958-86 Period

APPENDIX A

Tom's Place Area

Mammoth Visitor Center/Ranger Station

Lake View Picnic Ground

Modoc National Forest

Emerson Canyon Campground

Medicine Lake Swimming Beach

Howard Gulch Campground